FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-030
Tuesday
13 February 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-030 CONTENTS *13 February 1990*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Shevardnadze Attends 'Open Skies' Conference 1
  Arrives in Ottawa *[Moscow TV]* 1
  Delivers Speech *[TASS]* 1
  Meets With Baker *[Moscow TV]* 4
  Talks With Baker, European Counterparts *[TASS]* 4
High Hopes From 'Open Skies' Talks Discussed *[Solton on Moscow International]* 4
Chernyshev on U.S., USSR Troop Cuts Proposals *[TASS]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov on Monitoring of Nicaraguan Elections *[TASS]* 6
Kornilov on Conditions of German Unification *[TASS]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

IZVESTIYA Reports on Baker Address *[12 Feb]* 7
Glazunov Assesses Baker's Talks in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 8
Comparison—U.S.-Soviet Joint Statement 9
Lapygin, Security Delegates Conduct U.S. Visit 9
  Travel Westward 9 Feb *[TASS]* 9
  Visit Los Alamos, San Diego *[TASS]* 10
  Tour U.S. Navy Facilities *[TASS]* 10
Korionov Views Trends in Soviet-U.S. Relations *[PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 10
Commentator Questions Quayle's Views on USSR *[Zorin on Moscow International]* 11
VOA Cutbacks Attributed to Glasnost *[IZVESTIYA 4 Feb]* 12

Northeast Asia

Pyongyang Dedicated to 'Underlying Principles' *[NEW TIMES No 4]* 12
Dearth of CPSU Plenum Coverage in Pyongyang *[Kretov on Moscow Radio]* 13
Officials Receive Outgoing DPRK Ambassador 13
  Shevardnadze 5 Feb *[Moscow International]* 13
  Secretary Stroyev 9 Feb *[PRAVDA 10 Feb]* 13
MPRP Issues New Draft Regulations *[TASS]* 14
  New Draft Rules Discussed *[TASS]* 14
Stance of Mongolian Patriotic Front Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Feb]* 15
Program for Restructuring Mongolian Army Noted *[TASS]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Ryzhkov, Delegation Conclude Visit to Thailand 16
  Rogachev Confers With Minister *[TASS]* 16
  King Receives Ryzhkov *[Moscow International]* 16
  Prime Minister, Ryzhkov Meet *[TASS]* 16
  Ryzhkov Speaks at Luncheon *[TASS]* 17
  Joint Communique Released *[TASS]* 19
  Delegation Heads to Australia *[TASS]* 21
Delegation Opens Visit to Australia 13 Feb 22
  Australian Minister on Visit *[TASS]* 22
  Ryzhkov Arrives With Entourage *[TASS]* 22

- Usmanov Leads Parliamentarians on Hanoi Visit 23
  - 'Friendly Visit' Under Way *[TASS]* 23
  - Delegates Meet SRV Officials *[IZVESTIYA 11 Feb]* 23

Near East & South Asia

- Vorontsov Discusses Israeli Immigration Policy *[Moscow Radio]* 23
- Soviet Official Comments on Jewish Emigration *[Kuwait AL-ANBA' 9 Feb]* 24
- Shevardnadze Receives Afghan Ambassador *[PRAVDA 3 Feb]* 24
- Afghan Official Discusses Prospects for Peace *[TASS]* 25
- Proposed Negotiation Rekindles Hope in Sudan *[Moscow International]* 25

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Ministry Spokesman Welcomes Release of Mandela *[Moscow International]* 26
- Kapitsa Praises Nelson Mandela's Release *[Moscow International]* 26
- Valentinov on 'Obvious' Need for RSA Dialogue *[Moscow International]* 26
- KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Reports Crash *[10 Feb]* 27

East Europe

- TASS on German Reunification Issues 27
- GDR Developments; FRG Republicans' Activities *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 27
- Officer Comments on Relations With GDR Locals *[IZVESTIYA 8 Feb]* 28
- Shevardnadze, Polish Envoy Discuss Relations *[Moscow International]* 29
- Kwasniewski Views Role as SDRP Chairman *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 3 Feb]* 29
- Poland's Kwasniewski, Miller Thank Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 9 Feb]* 30
- IZVESTIYA Covers Unrest in Kosovo 30
  - Protests Over Violence Cited *[4 Feb]* 30
  - Belgrade's Clampdown 'Justified' *[6 Feb]* 31
- Trial of Ceausescu Aides Evokes 'Surprise' *[IZVESTIYA 4 Feb]* 31
- Ammunition Explodes at CSSR Military Test Site 32
  - Compensation To Be Offered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]* 32
  - Timing of Incident 'Annoying' *[IZVESTIYA 9 Feb]* 32

West Europe

- Falin, Delegation Depart for Strasbourg *[TASS]* 32
- Belgium's Defense Minister Continues Visit 32
  - Welcomed by Yazov, Moiseyev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]* 32
  - Tours Tank Division *[TASS]* 33
  - Accompanied to Bolshoi Theater *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Feb]* 33
  - Gives Address on 'New Europe' *[TASS]* 33
  - Received by Primakov, Belousov *[PRAVDA 10 Feb]* 34
  - Confers With Karpov 10 Feb *[TASS]* 34
  - Questioned at News Conference *[TASS]* 34
  - Discusses German Unification *[Moscow International]* 34
  - Opposes German Neutrality *[Brussels Radio]* 35
  - Meets Leningrad Commander *[TASS]* 35
- TASS Reports on Moiseyev's Visit to Finland 35
  - Trip Previewed; Goals Outlined 35
  - Moiseyev Arrives in Helsinki 36
  - Koivisto Confers With Moiseyev 36
- Yakovlev on Soviet Troops in 'Reunified Germany' *[Moscow International]* 36
- Medvedev Delegation Touring Great Britain 36
  - PRAVDA on Wales Visit *[11 Feb]* 36
  - Lloyds, Stock Exchange Toured *[Moscow TV]* 37

Latin America & Caribbean

- Nishanov Receives Brazilian Parliamentarians *[TASS]* 38
- Meeting of South American Communist Parties *[PRAVDA 6 Feb]* 38

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

- 3d Session Coverage of Supreme Soviet Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 39
- Supreme Soviet Commissions, Committees To Meet *[Moscow Radio]* 39
  - Commissions Lay Groundwork *[Moscow Radio]* 39
- 'Text' of Supreme Soviet Meeting 12 Feb *[TASS]* 39
- Supreme Soviet Committees Debate Land Law *[TASS]* 40
  - Commission Drafts Property Bill *[TASS]* 40
- Supreme Soviet Drafts Bill on Religious Freedom *[TASS]* 41
- Supreme Soviet Session To Focus on Economy *[TASS]* 41
- Foreign Economic Relations Bill Submitted *[TASS]* 42

CPSU Central Committee Plenum

- PRAVDA Publishes 7 February Plenum Speeches 42
  - Saykin on Party's 'Acute' Problems *[9 Feb]* 42
  - Maslyukov Address on Lithuania *[9 Feb]* 45
  - Klautsen Warns of Opposition Strength *[9 Feb]* 47
  - Yershova Calls for Communist Protection *[9 Feb]* 49
  - Turkmen Drilling Foreman on Perestroyka *[9 Feb]* 49
  - Burokyavichyus on Socialist Renewal *[9 Feb]* 51
  - Bashtanyuk on Party-Trade Union Relations *[9 Feb]* 54
- Yeltsin Interviewed on Party Plenum *[Budapest TV]* 55
- Participant Gives Impression of Plenum *[Moscow TV]* 56
- Commentator on Significance of CPSU Plenum *[IZVESTIYA 9 Feb]* 56
- Journalists Discuss Plenum Proceedings, Results *[Moscow International]* 57
- Plenum: Present Party 'Cannot Control Situation' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Feb]* 58
- Readers Voice Support for Plenum Decisions *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]* 59

Political & Social

- Gorbachev Meets With Perestroyka Representatives *[PRAVDA 12 Feb]* 59
- Further on Gorbachev Meeting With Lithuanian Aktiv *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 16 Jan]* 67
- Gorbachev Adviser on Soviet Political Change *[Rome ANSA]* 71
- Ryzhkov Speech to Syktyvkar Meeting *[PRAVDA 11 Feb]* 72
- Yeltsin Supports New RSFSR Constitution *[Moscow International]* 74
  - 'Election Platform' Outlined *[Moscow International]* 74
- Vorontsov Denies Rumors of Moscow, Odessa Pogroms *[TASS]* 75
- KGB Denies Rumors About Pogroms *[TASS]* 75
- Kiev Authorities Assail Pogrom Rumors *[TASS]* 75
- Pro-Gdlyan Demonstrators Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 11 Feb]* 75
  - Prosecutor To Seek Gdlyan Ouster *[PRAVDA 9 Feb]* 76
- Vremya Seen as Obsolete, Seven Days Lauded *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 5]* 76
- Head of New Research Center Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Feb]* 78

Regional Affairs

- 'Enraged' Residents Rally in Dushanbe 80
  - Five Reportedly Killed *[Moscow Radio]* 80
  - State of Emergency, Curfew Declared *[TASS]* 80
  - Looting, Arson Reported *[AFP]* 80
- Turkmen Supreme Soviet Appoints Officials *[TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 20 Jan]* 81
- Uzbek Unemployment Figures Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Feb]* 81
- Uzbek Health Official Gives AIDS Figures *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 14 Jan]* 82
- Kirghiz Supreme Soviet To Convene 10 Feb *[Frunze Radio]* 82
- Developments in Transcaucasus Reported *[Baku Radio]* 82
  - City 'Relatively Peaceful' 82

  - Inner City Tense, Rumors Spread ... 82
  - 12 Feb Situation Report ... 83
  - 13 Feb Situation Report ... 83
  - Trains To Move 13 Feb ... 84
- Nakhichevan Residents Mark Islamic Revolution Day *[Tehran Radio]* ... 84
- Armenian Supreme Soviet Resumes Work 12 Feb ... 84
  - Arutyunyan Delivers Report *[Moscow Radio]* ... 84
  - Constitution, Law on Elections Examined *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 84
- Estonian Government Meets 30 Jan *[Tallinn Radio]* ... 86
- Committee for 'Soviet Power' Formed in Estonia *[Moscow International]* ... 86
- Toompea Meeting Discusses Estonia's Future *[Tallinn Radio]* ... 86
- Estonian Party Fails To Produce Congress Documents *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Feb]* ... 87
- Common Platform Difficult for Estonian Communists *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Feb]* ... 87
- 'Free Estonia' Association Defines Goals *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 25 Jan]* ... 88
- Deputies' Group To Fight for 'Existing' Laws *[IZVESTIYA 6 Feb]* ... 89
- 70 Percent of Latvian Communists Favor CPSU Ties *[TASS]* ... 90
- Latvian Group on Independence by Legislative Means *[IZVESTIYA 8 Feb]* ... 90
- Latvian Komsomol Rejects Disbandment *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 3 Feb]* ... 90
- Latvian Tour Operator Claims Autonomy *[IZVESTIYA 7 Feb]* ... 92
- Latvian Farmers Establish Association *[TASS]* ... 92
- Live Relay of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet 12 Feb *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 92
- Lithuanian Parliament Legalizes Private Property *[TASS]* ... 94
- Lithuanian Resolution Annuls Accession to USSR *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 10 Feb]* ... 94
- Moscow TV on Split in Lithuanian Communist Party *[Moscow TV]* ... 95
- Astraukas' Resignation Speech Reported *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 17 Jan]* ... 95
- Brazauskas' Gives Election Acceptance Speech *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 17 Jan]* ... 96
- Debate on Servicemen's Vote in Lithuania *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 17 Jan]* ... 97
- Servicemen's Vote Referendum Report *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 17 Jan]* ... 98
- Belorussian Workers' Union Formed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 28 Jan]* ... 99
- Belorussian Resolution on Chernobyl Victims *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 6 Jan]* ... 100
- Ukrainian Party Issues Resolution on '30s' Famine *[TASS]* ... 101
- Ukraine Khmelnitskiy Obkom Leader Resigns *[Kiev International]* ... 102
- Ukrainian Obkoms Replace First Secretaries *[PRAVDA 11 Feb]* ... 102
- Ukrainian Party Obkom First Secretary Resigns *[Kiev Radio]* ... 102
- Ukrainian Oblast Secretaries Changed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 102
- Chernobyl Comission Meets in Kiev *[TASS]* ... 102
- Kiev Meeting Protests Provocations *[Kiev International]* ... 103
- Ivashko Attends Ukrainian Party Commission Session *[PRAVDA 2 Feb]* ... 104

Economic

- Views Regarding Increase in Transport Tariffs ... 104
  - Labor Official Protests *[TRUD 7 Feb]* ... 104
  - Finance Minister Defends *[PRAVDA 5 Feb]* ... 105
- First Three Years of Joint Ventures Assessed *[PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 5]* ... 107
- Candidate Questions Value of Five-Year Plans *[IZVESTIYA 8 Feb]* ... 109
- Ukraine Economy Changes to High-Tech Output *[IZVESTIYA 8 Feb]* ... 109
- Positive Trends Seen Despite Statistical Downturn *[IZVESTIYA 9 Feb]* ... 110
- Kucherenko Discusses Drafting of Law on Taxation *[PRAVDA 4 Feb]* ... 111
- Kazakhistan 1989 Economic Results Examined *[Alma-Ata Radio]* ... 113
- Tula Ammunition Plant Sets Conversion Example *[IZVESTIYA 8 Feb]* ... 114
- Quality Inspection Ends at Kemerovo Oblast Plants *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 11 Feb]* ... 114
- Soviet Organizations May Abandon Fiat Contract *[Moscow Radio]* ... 114
- Lithuanian Official Views Cut in Meat Deliveries *[TRUD 6 Feb]* ... 114

Scientific

- Reportage on Soyuz TM-9 Spacecraft Flight ... 116
  - Corrects Trajectory *[TASS]* ... 116
  - Soyuz TM-9, Mir Dock Smoothly *[Moscow Radio]* ... 116

Military

Historian on Access to Military Archives *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Komsomol Urged to Influence Interethnic Disputes *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Feb]* 119

Shevardnadze Attends 'Open Skies' Conference

Arrives in Ottawa

LD1202172190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Feb 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Fotinov, identified by screen caption] The airport of the Canadian capital. Comrade Shevardnadze, USSR Foreign Minister, who is heading the Soviet delegation to the "Open Skies" International Conference, arrived here on Sunday.

[Begin recording] [unidentified correspondent] What would you like to wish the participants in the Ottawa meeting?

[Shevardnadze] The wish that we may conclude our meeting successfully. I understand, and I have already said, that there will be contacts between ministers. Undoubtedly, there will be a dialogue on matters of disarmament and other confidence-builidng measures. [end recording]

Delivers Speech

LD1202213790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1905 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Ottawa, 12 February, (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, spoke at the International "Open Skies" Conference which opened here today.

He said: Esteemed Mr. Chairman! Ladies and gentlemen! The topic of "Open Skies" envisages an open discussion which can touch on many different aspects—from the conceptual to the technical.

I see my task as setting forth our view of the problem and concentrating on the key issues and points of departure.

The Ottawa conference is taking place during a winter which, despite all the sharp changes in temperature, cannot be called cold. Perhaps this meeting of ours in the Canadian capital is yet one more highly convincing testimony to the fact that the cold war has ended. It lasted around 40 years, leaving in human memory not only a cruel and harsh political cold, but above all fear, a lack of confidence in the future, and restrictions on what human beings value most—their freedom.

It is wrong to think that such deprivations affected society on only one side of the Iron Curtain. The passport stamp "invalid for travel to communist countries," was tangibly valid as a limit to freedom of movement in the West as well.

A reality common to both sides of the political divide was the prefix "anti," in both its Soviet and U.S. versions, which was attached to a countless multitude of things.

What, it would seem, is the point of remembering this now? In order not to forget why skies are closed or opened. Walls, curtains, and bans create fear, suspicion, intolerance and, when the world had all of these in excess, for long decades, everyone needed secretiveness. Thus, the skies were divided and closed, just as the world was divided and closed.

Now we need open skies—and not only skies—and the preparedness of the participants in the conference to discuss this idea shows great changes in our perception of one another.

When last September, in Wyoming, my friend Mr. Baker proposed to hold a round of talks on this problem not in a room but outdoors, under open skies, the weather was favorable to us. There was neither wind, nor rain, nor too hot a sun. I want to say only one thing: The idea of "open skies" is valid only in conditions of good international weather, and prerequisites for it have been created.

We are moving away from the primitive beliefs about the allegedly congenital aggressiveness of human and state communities.

We look at the problem of force from a new perspective. We are now aware of the fact that it is impossible to use it to solve even the most commonplace arguments, let alone the most complicated conflicts. We understand that it is cheaper and simpler to purchase resources for the needs of one's own development on markets than to seize, and that one cannot capture technology by force and compel it to work for one's benefit.

In the end, everything that is open—be it skies or land—starts with open thinking. The latter, and nothing but, is capable of recognizing and establishing as a standard the vital need for open exchange of information and open pursuit of truth and universal, national, and private interests.

Over the last few years, progressive thought has advanced far ahead in the understanding of openness as the main factor in any sphere of progress—intellectual, material or social. The sphere of security, where for a long time a mutual game of hide-and-seek has been played, has not been bypassed in this process either.

An historic threshold was crossed when at the Stockholm conference all the European states adopted the principle of on-site inspection.

Now, this principle is being applied in practice to the monitoring of the destruction of nuclear missiles and within the framework of implementing confidence-building measures. So far one has not had occasion to hear of a single complaint that inspections and checking have infringed on anyone's security.

The success and the advantage of monitoring are so unquestionable and the sphere of its use has so noticably broadened—not only in military matters, but also in solving ecological, humanitarian, economic, and other problems—that this may even engender a mood of placidity.

But it is too early to be complacent. That is why, with regard to the "open skies" concept, the question naturally arises: Do we need another type of monitoring when there are satellites and when groups of inspectors are working on the ground?

At this point we must state clearly: In the matter of monitoring there is no such thing as excess. This is not just a political statement. If we intend to continue along the path we have been following up till now—reducing troops and armaments, dismantling huge structures of military confrontation, and moving over to defensive doctrines and maintaining military potentials at levels of minimum sufficiency for defense purposes—then what we need is an even more effective and diversified system of monitoring which possesses a large reserve of reliability

I would even risk proposing the following formula: sufficiency in armaments and a surplus of verification capabilities.

This formula has been dictated not least by trends and prospects in the present European situation. We are witnessing the emergence of a Europe consisting not of three or four groups of states, but as an expanse with an immeasurably more complex political composition. Unfortunately, there are few people who will care to make the claim today that this new composition will not create new problems, engender new complications in the regions and reopen old wounds and scars.

In these conditions the "open skies" regime may become a very necessary and effective means of preserving and strengthening trust, and of removing suspicions and apprehensions which arise.

I think you know that as soon as the "open skies" idea was expressed by Mr. Bush, President of the United States, we immediately not only supported the idea, but also advocated something bigger, namely the expansion of the zone of international glasnost and openness.

Of course, watching the earth from the skies one can obtain some idea of the movements of naval vessels and submarines. But is this really sufficient today? For, today nuclear weapons, long-range cruise missiles, aircraft, and combat helicopters are leaving dry land for the seas and oceans.

But time and again, now at one set of talks and now at another, the question of naval weapons and confidence-building measures, which affect the activity of states on the seas and oceans, is set aside and is left without solution.

Moreover, no serious arguments are put forward. It is only said that it is technically difficult, allegedly, to monitor anything on ships and submarines. It turns out that inspection can arrive at a missile factory or a nuclear base, but in no event at a ship. Why? Because, it transpires, seamen have in their blood a pathological dislike for inspections. As if land missile troops had a burning love of inspections.

I think we must start melting this unassailable iceberg, which is left over as a legacy of the cold war.

Can we feel assured, knowing that outside the zone of glasnost there remains a sphere where an ever-growing mass of the most modern armaments is being concentrated? Mobile to the highest degree and designated primarily for use in offensive actions?

Let us face the truth: It is simplest of all today to carry out a sudden attack, military intervention, or aggression from the sea.

Of course, it is easier to look for something in the light rather than in total darkness. Instead of setting up more searchlights in a zone which is already strongly illuminated, a bright light should be directed into the darkest secluded corners of military activity.

Let us take space where, of course, not only the breeding of chickens goes on. It is overloaded, and not with observation satellites, alone. And are we so sure that all this "filling" is to the benefit of humankind and the world?

Closed space can render valueless the very idea of open skies.

I am certain that we need urgently to work out a system of monitoring [kontrol] of the space activity of states.

The adherents of maintaining nuclear weapons love to use the argument of some mad leader suddenly getting his hands on a nuclear bomb or missile and then, goodbye to life on earth!

A strong argument, but it belongs to the past.

Today, when one launch of space rockets and installations is already quite within the capability of private firms, we cannot be at all certain that one of them might not launch into space something that would make us hostages of their ambitions.

It is a matter of extreme regret that at the most advanced frontier of the intellect, we do not have sufficient native wit to concern ourselves over elementary precautionary measures.

If planes receive certificates of fitness to fly, if pilots undergo strict medical and professional checks, then all the more so should such procedures be applied to space installations.

It is essential to establish the most rigorous monitoring, primarily on Earth, so that weapons should not get into space. Glasnost, in our view, should begin with scientific developments. The sort of situation ought to be created when neither a state nor a "firm" would at all be able to launch into space something unknown, some kind of "black boxes." What is needed here is a particular kind of space ecological body of experts, which would give the "OK" to everything that is planned in space.

There is nothing unfeasible about establishing regimes of openness on land, at sea, and in space. Many of the forms of monitoring and verification [kontrol i proverka] have been already tried in space and are successfully used in everyday practice. There is a mass of promising studies, methods, suggestions.

In conformity with the idea of the "open sea" we could agree to exchange information about the fleets' potentials; to send notifications about the major exercises of the navy forces, about the movements of their large units, about the transfer of the forces by naval means into the regions which are close to the borders of other states; to invite observers for the naval exercises and maneuvers.

As for the "open space" regime, here we suggest the establishment of an international space inspectorate as a component part of the monitoring system for weapons' penetration into space, to create an international space observation agency.

If we take as a basis an age old principle of honesty and reciprocality, then we will not have unsurmountable difficulties in working out the measures and procedures which would make the skies, the land, the seas and oceans, and the space really open.

At the recent talks with Mr. Baker in Moscow, we agreed on mutual visits by specialists to certain radar stations. We consider this an important step in the strengthening of trust.

Now a few considerations on the subject of our dialogue with you.

Certainly, the conference should initiate progress toward an accord on establishing an "open skies" regime. Even at the first stage of the conference, it will be possible to achieve concrete results. For example, to adopt a declaration or some other document on fundamental approaches to such a regime, which would serve as a basis for the elaboration of an accord. The draft considerations of the Warsaw Treaty countries on this matter will be submitted by the Hungarian delegation.

An "open skies" agreement is seen by us as an independent document which is not formally tied to other agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament. At the same time there is a need for an essential link, in order for its operation to promote the prevention of possible violations of other international agreements and treaties, and in this context it is necessary for it to touch on them to a certain extent. For this reason we ought to preserve the opportunity of amending it, taking into account the way it will correlate with the obligations of the states party to a system under other accords in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament, and with the relevant mechanisms of verification and control.

In our understanding, the "open skies" system is the implementation by the participating states, on a reciprocal and equal basis, of flights by unarmed aircraft over the territory of other participating states in the system for observation of military activities.

The Soviet Union sees its aims as the strengthening of trust, the guaranteeing of predictablility in military activity, and promotion of the arms limitation and disarmament process and of monitoring of compliance with obligations in this sphere.

As we see it, at the initial stage it might be those countries which are at present involved in active dialogue on disarmament problems which would become party to the system. However, we do not exclude participation in this process by other states as well. In other words, in our opinion, the "open skies" system is the result of the conclusion of a multilateral agreement which would either regulate in detail the future system, or would briefly set out its aims and content, specified in protocols of a technical content attached to it.

The "open skies" system must be imbued with the principle of universal and full equality. Equality in gaining access to information which cannot be used to the detriment of any of the parties.

Equality from the viewpoint of the region of application of the system which covers the military activity of states not only on national territories but beyond, too.

Equality in relations to the quotas of flights, the use of aircraft, observation and data processing equipment.

One would like to hope that other participants in the conference, too, proceed from the need for equality of rights and a balance of interests of all the states.

Evidently, an agreement on the "open skies" should be open for further integrating provisions on "open seas" and "open space" into it. And of course, the creation of a coordinating organ, which would deal with everything related with observing the clauses of the agreement, settling unclear situations and solving disputes, should be stipulated in it.

Progress toward ever greater glasnost and openness and the global strengthening of trust would efficiently promote the construction of a comprehensive system of international security. It is precisely within this context that we are coming out in favor of the proposed measures.

I am convinced that they will initiate an absolutely unique system of trust which, in an integral unity with all the invaluable experience that has been amassed earlier in this area, will enhance Europe's prestige as a creative laboratory of openness, transparency, disarmament and joint search for ways toward a peaceful human community.

One would like to believe that this is guiding experience for humankind and that the UNO and all the continents and regions will back it, seeing it as an example and a model for creating a global system of trust.

Our heartfelt gratitude to Canada, its government and people, who have welcomed us so hospitably in Ottawa for work which is very important and necessary for humankind.

Meets With Baker

LD1302001190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2120 GMT 12 Feb 90

[From the "TV News Service" program]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze and Secretary of State Baker meet again today—this time at the negotiating table of the conference that began today in Ottawa. The conference is debating a question about the opening of air borders. The idea belongs to President Bush.

Talks With Baker, European Counterparts

LD1302095590 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 13 Feb 90

["Europe's Future Dominates Foreign Ministers' Talks"—TASS headline]

[Text] Ottawa February 13 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets:

NATO and Warsaw Treaty foreign ministers, attending the International "Open Skies" Conference here, are engaged in an intensive round of meetings and consultations outside the official programme.

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze held six separate meetings with his counterparts on Monday in-between conference sessions. He met James Baker (United States), Douglas Hurd (Britain), Roland Dumas (France), Krzysztof Skubiszewski (Poand), Fernandez Ordonez (Spain) and Antonis Samaras (Greece).

The prospects for European development and a united Germany were discussed. The recognition of the German people's right to self-determination should not lead to the neglect of the interests of other European peoples or damage to the principle of inviolability of borders, the rights and responsibilities of the four winner powers, it was stressed at the meetings.

The preparation of a conference of heads of state of Europe, the United States and Canada in 1990 was discussed in the light of the positive development of the European process. The successful completion of negotiations on cuts in conventional armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals and the finalising of a relevant accord at a summit meeting are important to further improve the situation in Europe, it was said.

The ministers discussed a range of problems, among them a possibility of using the existing institutions to bring the East and West European countries closer together, the situation in the Mediterranean, a Syprus settlement and other matters.

Some questions of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the above-mentioned countries were constructively discussed.

Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney held a luncheon in honour of Shevardnadze and Baker at his home on Monday.

High Hopes From 'Open Skies' Talks Discussed

LD1202134690 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Excerpts] February 12 is the first day of an international conference on open skies regulations in Ottawa. It brings together the foreign ministers of 23 member nations of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Here now we have a commentary from Yuriy Solton:

Moscow is pinning high hopes on the conference, in contrast with its past dislike on the open skies concept. When President Eisenhower of the United States proposed 35 years ago that all the nations allow each other's aircraft to overfly their terrorities and watch military activities, the Soviet Union rejected the proposal out of hand. At the time, the world politics were dominated by enmity and suspicion and the idea seemed as a propaganda ploy rather than a feasible plan. However, as it was revived last year Moscow was among the first to give it support.

The changing international situation has prompted the Soviet and many other governments to seek more openness in the military and other spheres. In fact, all 23 nations involved in the Ottawa conference have already welcomed in principle the open skies concept.

Civilian as military sceptics are pointing to logistical problems, political differences, and the need to protect military secrets. But their thinking seemed to be obsolete. True, certain questions are yet to be answered like, what will be the flight quotas? Will there be mixed crews? Or, will all Warsaw Treaty and NATO bases be open to inspection including those in the third countries?

It is exactly to achieve compromise on these and other topics that a top level conference has been convened. [passage omitted]

The idea which seemed utopian 35 years ago is now being put into practice. An agreement may be signed as early as this year to make open airspace over vast territories in Europe, Asia, and North America.

Chernyshev on U.S., USSR Troop Cuts Proposals

LD1202222690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Commentary by Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military analyst]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb (TASS)— One of the most important results of the meetings between James Baker and the Soviet leaders in Moscow is advancement along the path toward completing the working out of an agreement on conventional armed forces in Europe. As is known, at the Vienna talks, over a long period of time, no success was achieved in reaching an accord on the question of reducing the numbers of troop personnel. Now, following the Moscow meeting, this problem is, it would seem, leading up to a mutually acceptable solution.

There are two sides to this issue. The Warsaw Pact states earlier proposed that Warsaw Pact and NATO should reduce the numbers of their armed forces in central Europe to the level of 700-750,000 men. Bearing in mind the unwillingness of the Western countries to make such reductions at the present time, and also taking into account the fact that the talks will not end with the signing of the first agreement in Vienna, but will be continued further, Mikhail Gorbachev reported to the secretary of state that the Soviet leadership does not insist on determining the overall level of the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Pact within the framework of the whole European region. Thus, in this aspect, the positions of the sides at the Vienna talks have drawn closer.

Second, the Soviet Union accepted the U.S. President's proposal to reduce Soviet and American troops on foreign territories in Europe to 195,000 men, but not in central Europe as George Bush proposed, but throughout the European zone beyond the borders of the USSR.

Why did the initiative of the head of the U.S. Administration have to be somewhat "rectified"? Unfortunately, in its original form it enables the United States to have in Europe 30,000 more troops than the Soviet Union (on account of nonconsideration of the U.S. military contingents now stationed in Great Britain, Italy, Greece, Turkey). Such an inequitable approach by the United States obviously cannot satisfy the USSR. That is why the Soviet side proposed equal levels of troops for the USSR and the United States, located outside the national territories throughout Europe.

But if the figure of 195,000 does not suit the United States, then those same 30,000 to which Washington lays claim could be added to it, while spreading this maximum level of 225,000 men for both sides to the whole European continent. One would think this approach by the Soviet side was more just and, in the final analysis, will be rightly appraised and accepted by the U.S. leadership.

One would like to hope that in the current year the first treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe will be concluded with the application of the basic concepts on which the sides have already reached agreement. But even now opportunities can be discerned for further progress on the road to reducing the levels of military confrontation in Europe. For military detente in particular, of fundamental importance is the complete withdrawal of troops and elimination of bases on alien territories. In this connection the Soviet Government has just officially confirmed the USSR's adherence to its earlier-stated position—to withdraw all foreign troops from alien territories by the years 1995-96, and eliminate all military bases on foreign territories by the year 2000. Evidently the time has come for our Western partners, too, to look into the not-so-distant future and work out their own long-term plans for armed forces reductions.

Gerasimov on Monitoring of Nicaraguan Elections

LD1202222790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb—The unprecedented high level of international observation and monitoring of the general elections set for 25 February this year in Nicaragua was noted at a briefing today by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is recognized by practically the whole of the world community, including the United Nations and the OAS, he said.

During the elections there will be present in the country more than 400 observers as members of the UN mission and the OAS, as well as representatives of the European Parliament, governments, and parliaments, including the U.S. Congress, and representatives of nongovernmental and public organizations from West Europe, Latin America, and the United States, more than a thousand people in all. Twenty to 25 percent of the polling stations will be monitored by them.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs representative also said that in the UN mission report, it is stressed that such representation will "facilitate knowledge of the details of the election process in Nicaragua on an international scale" in order for the UN member states to recognize the results of the elections in Nicaragua on the basis of conclusions by international observers.

That is why, noted Gennadiy Gerasimov, "the expressed worries about the allegedly inadequate number of UN observers to realize an effective monitoring of the course of the election process are hardly justified." The assessments of the international observers already present in Nicaragua, he stressed, testify that the necessary conditions for carrying out really free and democratic elections have been created there.

Kornilov on Conditions of German Unification

LD1102020490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0950 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 February—TASS political commentator Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The visit to Moscow of Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Foreign Minister Genscher, which began today, is attracting close attention from the international public and press. What can be expected from the forthcoming meetings and talks, at the center of which is expected to be the problem of the two German states' unification? What is the Soviet side's position today? These questions are constantly present in the pages of the Western, and above all, West German press.

Our country's fundamental position is, meanwhile, well-known, and it remains unchanged. The aspiration of Germans in the GDR and FRG for rapprochement and interaction is perceived with understanding in the USSR. We are convinced a solution can also be found to the issue of German national unity, naturally within the framework of the Eurpean process and the structure of a Common Home on the continent. The Soviet side is prepared for a serious, constructive, and thorough discussion of various legal and political, economic, and military aspects of this problem. In light of the above, special significance, at which debates on the German question will certainly occupy a prominent place.

It is, of course, now difficult to forecast how the bilateral and multilateral dialogue will develop. In my view, various options could be advanced, and various proposals and "models" could be examined. I would, however, like to stress one thing: What place is apportioned by various capitals to the new German formation in the military-political structures already in existence on the continent is far from being a matter of indifference to the Soviet Union and indeed to other European states. In this context one cannot help being put on one's guard by the fact that even today, on the eve of the visit to Moscow by Kohl and Genscher, some people in Bonn, and not only there, are persistently "playing out" a political scheme whereby a future united Germany will be a member of the NATO bloc. It must be plainly said that this scheme cannot be understood or accepted by the Soviet public.

Recently, certain circles in the West, including at NATO headquarters in Brussels, have also been putting forward this option: The united Germany is part of NATO, but NATO troops and weapons will not be sited on the territory of the present-day GDR. It is difficult to regard this option, which some organs of the Western press are trying to depict as some kind of "concession to Moscow," as constructive or realistic. This is because it, too, does not, in our view, create any kind of reliable guarantees at all that German unity will not represent a source of danger to other states' security in the future.

Yes, the growing movement of Germans toward a single fatherland is an indisputable fact, and we in Moscow favor a united Germany, but a genuinely peace-loving, democratic Germany, a Germany which would not only not create a threat to its neighbors, but which would also become an important and strong link in European and general security.

United States & Canada

IZVESTIYA Reports on Baker Address

*PM1202110090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5*

[Report by TASS diplomatic correspondents A. Alekhin, A. Petrovskiy: "J. Baker: 'I Am Pleased With the Results of the Talks.' U.S. Secretary of State's Visit to the USSR Ends"]

[Text] "I am very pleased with the results of the Soviet-American talks. During my official visit to the USSR, considerable progress was achieved on the questions discussed. And whereas in Wyoming I spoke of the transition from rivalry to dialogue, after Malta and the present meeting this conviction has grown even stronger," U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker stated. After the end of the talks with E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, he spoke at a press conference held after midnight on 10 February in Moscow.

Our main aim was to achieve consensus on the major unresolved questions in time for the summit meeting in order to conclude a strategic offensive arms treaty this year. However, progress was also achieved on other, unplanned questions, which may have even greater significance; I mean the formulation of a joint statement on chemical weapons and progress on the question of sea-launched cruise missiles, the secretary of state stressed.

On the same day J. Baker met with members of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and USSR people's deputies in the Kremlin's Sverdlovsk Hall. This was the first time that such a high-ranking representative of the U.S. Administration had addressed the Supreme Soviet in his official capacity. And this event was possible as a result of a considerable, large-scale improvement in Soviet-American relations.

J. Baker addressed those present.

It is a great honor for me, he said, to address you, the founders of the new Soviet Union. And this unprecedented opportunity that I have been given symbolizes what I hope will prove to be a new era not only in the Soviet Union's policy, but also in relations between our countries.

The quintessence of American policy on the Soviet Union, the secretary of state noted, is the quest for points of contact which will lay firm foundations in our relations. Only by renouncing confrontation and going over to dialogue and cooperation can we transform our relations. The hostility of past years could be replaced by mutual understanding and sympathy, and even when we do not agree, every dispute should not turn into a crisis that revives the specter of the cold war. In those days any crisis was regarded as a very serious threat. But tomorrow, in times of peace, let us remember that a crisis can also be an opportunity to create a better world.

J. Baker went on to dwell on the areas in which, in his opinion, the United States and the USSR could collaborate productively in the interests of both countries. First and foremost, the speaker said, in Europe we would like to cooperate with the Soviet Union and the other countries of the continent with a view to putting an end to the division of Europe and turning it into a united and free continent.

Second, in regional conflicts our diplomacy seeks the political, rather than military, settlement of various disputes that continue to threaten the world's stability. We are making progress on a number of problems, such as in southern Africa and Southeast Asia. The secretary of state expressed particular concern over the military supplies that the USSR continues to deliver to those who seek, in its opinion, to resolve by military means conflicts in regions that the United States regards as vitally important to it. Frankly speaking, he stressed, the American people and their representatives in Congress cannot understand how the Soviet Union can allow billions of rubles to be sent to countries like Cuba and Nicaragua. It is especially hard to understand, given that this is happening at a time when the Soviet people themselves need their limited resources, which could be used at home.

Third, the United States and the USSR could make considerable progress not only in reducing nuclear arms, but also conventional and chemical arms. G. Bush has put forward a practical proposal aimed at banning these terrible weapons. And I am happy that the United States and the Soviet Union have made a joint statement on the key elements of the President's initiative, he said. We also want to cooperate more effectively with your government on the question of the proliferation of missiles in third world countries.

Fourth, the American side may have something to offer you regarding the creation of a rule-of-law state. I do not think our democracy is beyond reproach, but it is constantly striving for something better. We attach particularly great significance to turning respect for human rights into the law. From our viewpoint, the renunciation of the party's exclusive monopoly of power by the recently ended CPSU Central Committee Plenum is a very important step toward democracy.

Fifth, we are studying the technical possibilities of the transformation of the administrative edict system into a market system. In our opinion certain changes should be made to legislation so that our cooperation can flourish. We should extend and deepen cooperation on problems of environmental conservation.

I believe, the secretary of state stressed, that in these five spheres we can collaborate actively in the interests of both the Soviet and the American people. I cannot promise, and no one could do so, that our desire for cooperation will always bear fruit. However, I can say this: The American people and the peoples of the Soviet Union always have great respect for each other's achievements, and each of us has a tremendous historical and cultural heritage. Nonetheless, for 40 years we were in a state of cold war with each other. The moment has now come, J. Baker stated, when we must leave that legacy behind us. Different tasks face us in a changing world. We should try to understand each other, reach a consensus, and work together on the basis of that consensus. And together we must try to extend our ties.

The time has come to create a new heritage and pass beyond the bounds of the cold war, the U.S. secretary of state stressed.

In his speech the Supreme Soviet's guest highlighted many important aspects of relations between the United States and the USSR and gave an assessment of the situation in the world. However, the deputies did not agree with some of the secretary of state's ideas, nor did they agree with the American administration's policy on certain questions. Thus, for instance, perplexity was expressed at the fact that in the atmosphere of a thawing international climate and the improvement in Soviet-American relations. Washington has yet to raise the question of the future of numerous U.S. military bases located on the territory of other states, and the development of sophisticated types of arms continues. Nor do the USSR people's deputies understand why the United States stubbornly refuses to discuss the problem of limiting the naval arms race. Soviet parliamentarians have yet to receive a reply from the American side to the Supreme Soviet's message to the U.S. Congress on the question of a moratorium on nuclear explosions and the ending of nuclear tests, which was sent to the American side back in August 1989. The Soviet Union's serious concern over the U.S. aggression against Panama was expressed. Nor was there support for J. Baker's opinions on the nature of our relations with Nicaragua and Cuba.

Naturally, the people's deputies had questions to put to the head of the U.S. foreign policy department. One of them asked whether it would not be possible, within the framework of the development of relations between our countries, to organize joint actions to free the Soviet prisoners of war held by the Afghan armed opposition. This is not ideology or politics, the deputy said, it is purely humanitarian assistance to people who are suffering as a result of a violation of international law.

On my previous visit to Moscow last May, J. Baker said, I met several deputies, and this question was discussed. On my return to the United States we examined it so we could decide what might be done to help secure the release of the Soviet prisoners of war. I think certain positive results are already emerging here. In any event, we will continue these efforts, because we regard them as expedient, sensible, and humane.

Concluding the meeting with the U.S. secretary of state, A.S. Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, expressed the view that the meeting confirmed the mutual interest in continuing to have opportunities for such a wide exchange on the content of Soviet-American meetings and on the most important problems of contemporary international development. We learned with great satisfaction, he said, that the preparations for the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush are proceeding successfully and that it will take place in the summer of this year. We are confident—and we ask you to inform the U.S. Administration in Washington of this—that the forthcoming Soviet-American dialogue at the highest level will be an important new stage in the further progressive development of positive relations between our countries.

Taking part in the meeting were Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy foreign minister; and J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR.

In the afternoon J. Baker left Moscow.

Glazunov Assesses Baker's Talks in Moscow

LD1202160990 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] And now Viktor Glazunov sums up the talks that were held in Moscow when the United States Secretary of State James Baker was visiting the Soviet capital last week.

[Glazunov in Russian fading into English translation] Both sides are pleased with the outcome of the talks. Both talked about remarkable progress, in the first place on the Soviet-American summit to be held next June. The key goal for the summit is a treaty to cut by half strategic weapons. Solutions were found for some problems and there were signs of progress for disputes. As a result, confidence has grown that the treaty will be signed this year and that, thanks to Soviet-American initiatives, the Vienna talks will see a breakthrough and a comprehensive treaty will be signed this year as well to reduce conventional armed forces in Europe. Besides, the Soviet-American summit next June will most likely produce both an agreement to abolish most of the chemical weapons and a control protocol to the 1974-1976 treaty limiting underground nuclear explosions.

There has been headway in some other directions, too, thanks to the proposals both sides advanced. The Moscow talks showed Soviet-American relations are moving from understanding to cooperation to solve the questions the whole world is facing. Still, we would like this vital process to be more energetic and consistent. Take reigonal conflicts. Far from all of them depend for action on the Soviet Union and the United States alone. But have the Soviet Union and the United States been doing their best to help resolve these conflicts?

Take Afghanistan: The United States proposed to this country at the Geneva talks in the past that both nations should stop supplying weapons to the conflicting sides. The Soviet Union rejected at that time. The United

States is doing the same now, though it's clear a stop to weaponry delivery would get the Afghan war under control.

Or let's take disarmament. Obviously, a 50-percent reduction in strategic arms is a large-scale move to get rid of the military confrontation the cold war produced. But what's causing concern is this: While the treaty is outlined, the United States is modernizing strategic forces and developing and testing more missiles. And this country, too, has been launching missiles in reply, and, while diplomats are busy with the old arsenals, military and technical development may leave them well behind. Hasn't the time come for the Soviet Union and the United States to discuss the urgent termination of both production and deployment of more weapon systems? This, we believe, would notably speed up the work of dismantling military structures.

Comparison—U.S.-Soviet Joint Statement

PM1202135590

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 February 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 4 an unattributed version of the Soviet-U.S. joint statement on Secretary of State Baker's talks with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Joint Statement," has been compared with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 12 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, beginning on page 20, under the headline "'Text' of Joint Statement," revealing the following variations:

Page 20, column two, paragraph two, sentence one, PRAVDA begins: [Text] Talks were held... (deleting first paragraph; omitting quotation marks)

Paragraph six, penultimate sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...of bilateral relations, as well as within the framework... (retranslating)

Page 21, column one, first full paragraph, only sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...exchanged proposals along several avenues.

As far as... (retranslating)

Third full paragraph, second sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...missiles will be solved on the basis... (retranslating)

Column two, fifth full paragraph, second sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...their countries that would embrace both fundamental and... (retranslating)

Page 22, column one, paragraph one, first full sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...continue the joint discussion of this problem in the period until the next meeting of ministers. (adding words)

Second full paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...of free and fair elections in Nicaragua... (changing "just" to "fair")

Column two, first full paragraph, sentence four in PRAVDA reads: ...role. They also emphasized the necessity for... (retranslating)

Fifth full paragraph, sentence two in PRAVDA reads: ...with the lack of progress in the... (adding "of")

Page 23, column one, paragraph one, sentence one in PRAVDA reads: ...anxiety over the growing threat of starvation... (adding "growing")

Column two, paragraph one, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...and humanitarian issues.

V.

The minister of... (inserting Roman numeral subhead)

Third full paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...examine questions of collaboration in the prevention of, and the struggle against... (retranslating)

Fourth full paragraph, sentence two in PRAVDA reads: ...on mutual understanding and cooperation in the struggle against... (retranslating)

Page 24, column one, first full paragraph, only sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...international organization's efficiency.

VI.

In the sphere... (deleting editorial note)

Sixth full paragraph, last sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...and Development (OECD). They also noted the opportunities which could emerge through the conference on economic cooperation in Europe.

The USSR minister... (adding sentence)

Column two, paragraph one, sole sentence in PRAVDA reads: ...cultural and information centers in the two... (adding "centers")

Third full paragraph, sentence one in PRAVDA reads: ...to examine and solve matters of Soviet-U.S.... (retranslating)

Same paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA ends: ...ministers in Washington. (omitting closing quotation marks)

Lapygin, Security Delegates Conduct U.S. Visit

Travel Westward 9 Feb

LD1002101290 Moscow TASS in English 1901 GMT 9 Feb 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] Washington February 9 TASS—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet's committee on defence and state security, now visiting the United States, today left the U.S. Andrews Air Force Base near the American capital for a tour of the country.

The delegation, invited to visit the United States by the U.S. Congress, is led by Vladimir Lapygin, chairman of the above committee.

The delegation will make its first stopover in Kirtland Air Base in the state of New Mexico. Nearby, in Los Alamos, there is an atomic laboratory which the delegates are planning to visit.

During the coming week the Soviet parliamentarians will also visit major U.S. naval bases on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, San Diego in California and Norfolk in Virginia, the NORAD headquarters in Colorado and the Strategic Air Command in Nebraska and visit other U.S. military facilities.

Visit Los Alamos, San Diego

LD1002235290 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Washington February 10 TASS—A delegation of the Soviet parliament's committee for defence and security, visiting in the United States at the invitation of the U.S. Congress, left Washington for a tour of the country on Friday.

Later in the day the delegation arrived at Kirtland Air Base on the outskirts of Albuquerque, New Mexico.

From the air base the delegation members were helicoptered to Los Alamos where they visited the national nuclear laboratory.

The programme of the tour was so packed that the delegation arrived at the San Diego, California, naval base, the largest one on the U.S. Pacific coast, Friday night.

Over there, they were welcomed by representatives of the U.S. Pacific Command, local authorities, and people of California.

Tour U.S. Navy Facilities

LD1102111190 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 11 Feb 90

[By TASS correspondent Stanislav Lunev]

[Text] Washington February 11 TASS— A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet's committee for defence and security issues visited several military facilities at the U.S. San Diego Naval Base in California on Saturday.

The delegation, invited to the United States by the U.S. Congress, is headed by Vladimir Lapygin, chairman of the defence and security committee.

It visited the base's Marine Recruiting Centre, one of the largest in the country, and saw the port of the naval base from a Coast Guard boat.

The delegation was also shown major combat aircraft of the U.S. Navy, including an F-14A fighter-bomber, in flight and was acquainted with an E-2C warning and control aircraft and other naval aviation equipment.

On Sunday, the delegation will see the sights around San Diego and meet with representatives of the U.S. Military Command, the local authorities and the public.

Korionov Views Trends in Soviet-U.S. Relations

PM1302095490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Feb 90 Second Edition p 6

[Vitaliy Korionov "View From Moscow" column: "A Guide for the Nineties"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] It is just over four months since the Wyoming talks between the U.S. and Soviet foreign ministers, and only two months since M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with G. Bush off Malta. But even in this short space of time it has become even more obvious what great reserves for strengthening world peace lie in our two countries' transition from mutual understanding to collaboration.

The first and therefore the most difficult page in the annals of building a nuclear-free world has been written: The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles is being implemented without a hitch. But it is not only a question of eliminating two classes of nuclear missiles, although that in itself is an unprecedented event. A powerful boost has been given to the resolution of the entire arms reduction problem—from the elimination of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, to the arrival down the homestretch of talks on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms along with the acceleration of the Vienna talks on reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe.

Speaking at a conference of the Reserve Officers Association, General C. Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, noted: "Something fundamental has changed" in the world, "and we must adapt our strategy to this new reality." He acknowledged that the probability of the Soviets using their military potential "against us or our allies in Europe is now the smallest in recent decades." In these conditions the U.S. military budget, the general said, "will be reduced annually by a few percent in the foreseeable future," and the United States will also have to embark on general reductions in its Armed Forces. But Powell was then heard to say: "We should have the most up-to-date strategic forces possible. This is a sphere in which we can never allow anyone to move ahead of us."

So: "Never!" Yet at around the same time Democrat T. Weiss, member of the House of Representatives, stated: "The military is ignoring civilian areas of the economy." In the last 40 years, according to his calculations, the United States has spent an astronomical sum on military needs—$7.6 trillion, which is considerably more than was spent on the entire civilian infrastructure of the American economy.

At the same time the results of two public opinion polls were published in the United States. A poll conducted by THE NEW YORK TIMES and CBS Television showed that three out of four Americans think that the thaw in relations between the United States and the USSR opens up the path to reducing military spending and using the resources thus freed to resolve their country's most pressing problems. It should be recalled that in the early eighties only 7 percent of U.S. citizens were in favor of reducing the military budget. [passage omitted]

All the same, U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney continues to stand firm. "Even if we reach a strategic offensive arms agreement," he asserts, "we will still have to go forward with the modernization of our strategic forces." And indeed, Washington is again focusing attention on the so-called strategic modernization program. Just one example: The draft military budget submitted to Congress by the Pentagon for fiscal 1991 proposes the appropriation of $4.4 billion for the implementation of the "Star Wars" program, which is $900 million more than in the current fiscal year. Furthermore, the magazine NEWSWEEK reported that the discussion of options for "future wars" continues in Pentagon circles.

All the same, I am sure that these harebrained schemes are not characteristic of the position of realistically minded America. The calendar says 1990, not 1980. America is no longer the same, and the world around it is no longer the same. Sensible politicians in the United States warn: A decade ago, U.S. strategy in the sphere of national security rested on three props: the cold war, U.S. leadership among Western countries, and economic, scientific, and technical superiority. The situation has changed now: The cold war is a thing of the past, the dominant U.S. role in relations with the West European allies is being forced to give way to partnership, and the American economy demands a reduction in the budget and foreign trade deficit. In these conditions, these politicians note, the United States must think in terms of not so much expanding as maintaining its international positions.

Real opportunities to achieve major accords on a broad range of disarmament problems in the near future are reinforced by the results of the Soviet-American talks held last week in Moscow. Through the efforts of both sides, the way is being cleared to ensure that the forthcoming meeting of the top leaders of the USSR and the United States is marked by the signing of agreements on strategic offensive arms, protocols to the 1974 and 1976 treaties on ending nuclear tests, and a number of other documents. Washington's intention of "forming new global relations with the Soviet Union," formulated by U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, is meeting with understanding in Moscow.

Realism, farsightedness, honest cooperation between equal sides—that is our true guide for the nineties.

Commentator Questions Quayle's Views on USSR

LD1102124390 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 11 Feb 90

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Text] And now it's time for the weekend commentary "Moscow Viewpoint," contributed by our political observer Valentin Zorin.

In America and elsewhere in the world, there are now wide discussions of the decisions taken at the recent plenum in Moscow of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee. The news that new steps were taken at the plenum to promote democracy toward a multiparty system on the proposal of the party's General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev was welcomed.

But on the eve of the plenum, as many listeners may remember, the CNN television company of the United States spread a rumor that Mikhail Gorbachev might step down as general secretary. The rumor, immediately refuted in Moscow, still had produced some nervousness on the stock markets of the West and disturbed politicians, and for clear reasons. Much depends in this world today on personalities, on the top political leaders, especially of great powers. By the way, in this connection I am giving thought now and then to the situation that might have occurred in a change of leadership in Washington.

We here in the USSR have respect for the President of the United States, George Bush, and wish him political stability and health, but that's life. What will happen to the United States policies if, God forbid, George Bush leaves his post and the vice president, Dan Quayle, becomes President under the Constitution? Judging by his statements, his views on Soviet-American relations are different from the current line of the White House. For instance, the vice president said recently in an interview for the newspaper SEATTLE TIMES that peace now was more dangerous than ever before, and the Americans should remember that the Soviet Union has its dark sides. Commenting on such statements by Dan Quayle, THE NEW YORK TIMES said that the vice president obviously did not like the policy of the U.S. Administration toward the USSR, and that his pronouncements reflected this mood.

Talking to journalists and officials coming here from the United States I always ask them how we should understand this special line of Dan Quayle toward the Soviet Union. Some of them told me not to take him too seriously. Others said he was inexperienced, or that he did not have much say on the national policies. However, I am not convinced by their reasoning.

I took an interest in a remark by a NEW YORK TIMES observer that the vice president was doing someone's bidding. The observer meant there are influential quarters that don't like the rapprochement and the growing understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union. Meanwhile the fact that the political processes may be irreversible, including Soviet-American relations, is a major issue of today. I believe that both the American and the Soviet people must be certain the processes are irreversible and that the relations between our two countries will be developing only along the path of cooperation.

VOA Cutbacks Attributed to Glasnost

PM0902115590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Nadein dispatch: "Involuntary Casualties of Glasnost"]

[Text] Washington—The VOA leadership is dropping broadcasts in six out of 43 languages. The reason is to save money. VOA Director Richard Carlson said: "We ourselves have done what 30 years' of jamming couldn't."

The management has already named the 57 staff who will lose their jobs. R. Carlson called it the hardest, saddest day of his professional life. In particular, broadcasts in Uzbek are being stopped, and programs in Russian are being cut back.

The U.S. Information Agency (USIA), of which VOA is a part, is aiming to save around $2.8 million. However, an additional $167,000 will have to be spent at the outset on severance payments and other needs.

Having been through the trials of jamming and emerged strengthened, VOA has been forced to slacken its pace during the period of glasnost. Recognizing that the former level of spending on the radio station was inexpedient, the U.S. Government has confirmed in perhaps the most convincing way possible the role of glasnost in the process of world information exchange.

It would be dishonest not to note that the VOA journalists include some people who have made a considerable personal contribution to this process. It is genuinely a pity when such specialists—major experts on the countries to which they broadcasted—lose their jobs. We can express the hope that people living in peace will need no fewer intermediaries than they did during the "cold war" period.

Northeast Asia

Pyongyang Dedicated to 'Underlying Principles'

PM0702165090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 4, 23-29 Jan 90 p 31

[Georgiy Toloraya dispatch: "Opening Up?"]

[Text] Pyongyang—In the 42nd year of its existence, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains firmly dedicated to the original underlying principles of its economic and political system. The policy of building state socialism has created a situation markedly different from that in other socialist countries. What has it brought to the people? What problems are worrying the country today?

The country, devastated by two wars, had to start from scratch. Besides restoring factories and mines, it had to build up industries which could fully meet the domestic needs. The task of "relying on one's own forces," set by the Workers' Party of Korea in those years is still on the agenda. Extensive development enabled North Korea to augment its economic potential. Today the country can boast of its large-scale mining, metallurgical, power, chemical and diversified machine-building industries.

In per capita output of steel, cement, metalworking lathes and in other fields, People's Korea is ahead of many European socialist countries. However, the building of a technological chain from the mining of raw materials to the manufacture of finished articles within narrow national bounds has led to a drop in total output, the weakening of ties with the world market, and low efficiency of the economy.

This can be seen from available statistics. With per capita national income constituting half or even a third of that in European socialist countries, North Korea surpasses them in the share of industry in the national income (about 60 per cent). Moreover, heavy industry accounts for a roughly two thirds of industrial output.

Since the industries producing consumer goods are weak, the authorities have introduced the rationing of consumer goods for the sake of maintaining social justice. Nor has the country been able to solve the food problem by its own forces. All staples are rationed. And this despite the fact that Korean peasants work hard on their land, and irrigated rice growing, their traditional occupation, has achieved high efficiency over the past centuries. The reason lies in the shortage of arable land. On the contrary, livestock breeding does not have deep roots in the country. Marine food, not meat, prevail in the diet of Koreans.

The modest, even ascetic way of life does not, however, prevent Korean working people from showing examples of labour heroism. People work selflessly, because, as Kim Il Sung said, "their personal interests fully coincide with the interests of society." It is not accidental that the words "front," "battle" and "shock-work team" are often mentioned in economic reports.

It is believed in the republic that labour enthusiasm is essential for economic progress. To keep up this enthusiasm, the authorities constantly keep people on the alert, against an "external enemy," imperialism, which presents a mortal danger to them.

In the atmosphere of tension generated by this danger the labour efforts should, naturally, be stimulated morally, rather than materially. Accordingly, economic management is characterized by rigid centralism, which reminds one of the administrative-command system in the Soviet Union in the years of its industrialization drive.

The present level of North Korea's economic development is certainly incomparable with that in the colonial past. But the world technological revolution and the rapid growth of new Asian industrialization are raising before the country the task of a qualitative improvement. This means not only the overcoming of imbalances, the doing away with the lag of the raw materials, fuel and power industries and transport, which causes production failures, but also an extensive retooling of the economy.

The technical revolution is considered the most important task of the current seven-year plan. The Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea met twice to discuss various aspects of the introduction of scientific achievements in the economy, with special emphasis laid on electronics, means of automation, biotechnology and a more effective use of energy resources.

The need to raise living standards, "to solve the problems of food, clothes and housing" has come to the fore.

People's Korea is giving greater consideration to ties with the outside world. It is necessary to increase the export of not only such traditional items as raw materials, ferrous metals, minerals, building materials and refractories, but also of textiles, machines and other manufactured goods. It is not easy, however, to penetrate into the world market. That is why North Koreans are pinning their hopes on joint ventures.

The law adopted in 1984 opened the doors to foreign businessmen wishing to invest their capital in the country's economy. True, not so many businessmen responded because of the inadequate knowledge of economic conditions in the country, its foreign debt and mistrust. However, great interest was shown by ethnic Koreans living in Japan. The enterprises founded jointly with them have come to play an important part in the North Korean economy. They have formed a virtually new sector operating on market principles in the centralized economic system.

Cautious steps towards broader money and commodity relations have also been made in other fields. Markets have been reopened, and the sale of goods on commission has resumed. The authorities have set up currency shops, in which goods are not distributed but sold. It seems that the process of changes in economic management, exchange and distribution is beginning to develop in keeping with the needs of the country's productive forces.

Dearth of CPSU Plenum Coverage in Pyongyang

LD1002034990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 8 Feb 90

[Report by Mikhail Kretov in Pyongyang]

[Text] All these days I have been carefully studying Pyongyang central newspapers, listening to the local radio and unfailingly watching TV news programs in the hope to read or at least to hear at least some report on the work of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum in Moscow. Not a line, not a word on either its opening, the decisions, or the plenum's closing. One gets the impression the mass media of the DPRK are purposely hushing up the events taking place in our country on the renewal of socialism, not only in ours. Likewise the perestroyka processes in the East European countries are not being covered at all, let alone analyzed on the pages of the press, on the radio, on the television in People's Korea. A report came from Moscow this morning already about the closing of the work of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the decisions made there. I tried to find out the opinion of ordinary passers-by in the streets of Pyongyang on this event in the life of Soviet Communists. But alas! The interviews never took place. Confronted with my questions people shrugged their shoulders in surprise or even simply turned away, hurrying on their business. Only one elderly Korean man said frankly that it was the first time he heard about it. Indeed, how can he know about it, if until now nowhere in the country has the CPSU Central Committee Plenum been reported about? The DPRK citizens simply have no other sources of information. Radios, which by no means can be found in each flat, are turned onto the local station only. So, I say it again, in the mass media the DPRK there have been no reports so far on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that has taken place, let alone commentaries on or an analysis of the plenum's decisions.

Officials Receive Outgoing DPRK Ambassador

Shevardnadze 5 Feb

SK1102132190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 5 Feb 90

[Talk from the "Annals of Friendship" program]

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau and minister of foreign affairs, has received Comrade Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the Soviet Union, who will return home. On this occasion, he expressed his satisfaction over the gradual development of the Soviet-Korean relations and [words indistinct] of over-all cooperation.

Secretary Stroyev 9 Feb

PM1202162190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reception of Ambassador"]

[Text] On 9 February Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR, in connection with the completion of his diplomatic mission in Moscow.

Mutual interest in further developing ties between the CPSU and the Workers Party of Korea and strengthening Soviet-Korean relations was expressed during a conversation which proceeded in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

MPRP Issues New Draft Regulations

LD0602140690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0625 GMT 6 Feb 90

[By TASS correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 6 Feb (TASS)—The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] is beginning the process of self-renewal. A draft of a new edition of the MPRP regulations has been put forward for general discussion. This is because of the need to bring the basic law of party life into line with the requirements of perestroyka in the country, B. Dash-Endon, deputy chief of the Party Organs Department of the MPRP Central Committee told a TASS correspondent.

The renewal of the party is linked not only with the expansion and deepening of democracy within the party but also with clarifying the place and role of the party within society. For example, in the section of the draft entitled "The Party and State and Public Organizations" the term "leadership" used in the current regulations is replaced by the word "interaction".

The command style still predominates in much of the work of party organs, the senior official from the MPRP Central Committee admits, but the party is freeing itself of such outdated methods. The published draft of the new edition of the MPRP regulations contains much that is new and which is in accordance with the spirit of changes and the spirit of new political thinking.

The draft of the new edition of the MPRP regulations envisages a large increase in the rights of party members. For example, a communist can criticize party members and party organs of any rank at party meetings and in the party press.

Incidentally, as regards party meetings, the draft contains no strict ruling on how often they should be held. The draft presented for general discussion proposes that meetings should be held as frequently as is deemed necessary by members of primary organizations, but at least eight times per year. The paragraph proposing that party members should have the right to express no-confidence in leaders and officials in party committees represents a significant increase in the rights of MPRP members.

Along with the expansion of the rights of party members, an expansion of the independence of party groups is envisaged. In particular, it is proposed that acceptance for candidate membership of the party should be resolved at a meeting of the primary organization without any need for subsequent approval at a higher level. Let's say, this could be at the bureau of a town or village MPRP committee.

One of the new provisions of the draft is the section under which secretaries of party committees can be elected to their post for no more than two consecutive terms.

To continue the list of additions and changes proposed to the current MPRP regulations would take up much room. Without a doubt this painstaking work on the draft of an important party document indicates that the party of Mongolian Communists really is striving to free itself from formalism and sincerely wishes to become the true vanguard of society, whose aim is "humane democratic socialism and the prosperity of the homeland and its people".

New Draft Rules Discussed

LD0602185990 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 6 Feb 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar February 6 TASS—By TASS correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev:

"The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) is launching a self-renewal process. A draft new edition of the party rules has been submitted for a nationwide discussion. This was prompted by the need to bring the fundamental law of party life into line with restructuring requirements in the country," B. Dashendon, head of the party development department of the MPRP Central Committee, told TASS.

"The renewal of the party is connected not only with the broadening and deepening of inner-party democracy but also with a more precise definition of the party's place and role in society," he said.

"For example, the term 'guidance' is replaced by the word 'cooperation' in the draft rules section concerning the party, state and public organisations, unlike the current rules.

"Much in the work of party bodies is still imbued with the command style,: Dashendon admitted. "But the party is getting rid of such outdated methods. There is much new in the published draft new edition of the party rules that accords with the spirit of changes and new political thinking."

"The draft party rules envisage much broader rights for party members. At party meetings, communists may criticise any party members or party bodies of any rank.

"The draft rules do not specify strict time limits for holding party meetings. It is suggested holding meetings as frequently as the members of primary organisations deem it necessary, but not less frequent than eight times a year.

"A provision that suggests giving the right to party members to pass a vote of no confidence in leaders and functionaries of party comnmittees is a substantial extension of the rights of party members.

"At the same time provision is made for broadening the independence of primary party organizations. It is suggested that the question of admitting people as candidate members of the party be decided at meetings of primary organisations, without a later endorsement at a higher level—at the bureaus of city or aimag (province) committee of the party.

"One of new provisions is that the secretaries of party committees may be elected for the position that not more than two terms in succession."

Stance of Mongolian Patriotic Front Viewed

PM1202154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Nabatchikov dispatch: "Patriotic Unity Front"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—The creation of a voluntary new sociopolitical organization—the Mongolian Patriotic Unity Front [MPUF]—has been announced here. Its key ideological slogan is reliance on patriotism and national consensus to implement the tasks of accelerating perestroyka, the main gist of which the front's initiators see as being to "replace the administrative-edict, Stalinist model of socialism with a humane and democratic society."

A report disseminated for Mongolian and foreign journalists points out that it is planned to stage the new organization's constituent congress no later than next month. Meanwhile an action group has been formed to set up the MPUF which includes representatives of broad circles of the Mongolian public—workers, academics, writers, artistes, journalists, lawyers, teachers, and religious.

The MPUF, the report states, wholly shares the position of the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party] that in order to overcome the difficulties that are inevitable in the process of renewal, to rectify mistakes, and to ensure progressive development we need to consolidate all progressive and patriotically minded sociopolitical forces and movements in the country on a democratic footing. Assessing the real situation, the initiators of the front came to the same opinion that it is necessary to start a new movement for nationwide consensus.

"We are striving," L. Chuuschaan, the famous Mongolian writer and coordinating secretary of the front's action group, told journalists, "to unite and cooperate with all mass organizations and movements—both formal and informal—and with individuals, irrespective of their political views and platforms. And on that basis we intend through joint and collective efforts to defend Mongolian citizens' fundamental interests and rights, to uphold plurality of opinions and freedom of conscience, to develop Mongolian national culture and traditions, and to strive to elaborate mutually acceptable compromise concepts, views, and positions on the most topical problems of the development of Mongolian society."

It also follows from L. Chuuschaan's statement that in implementing these goals the front will act openly, publicly, autonomously, and independently. But above all it will "rely on the wisdom of collective reason" and on broad public opinion in the country—not least in elaborating its position vis-a-vis the current party and state leadership.

Advocating the creation of a national center for the study of public opinion, the front's founders noted that, apart from protecting the population's interests vis-a-vis different official bodies, its activities will be geared to the utilization of the recent positive democratic gains by working people in the other socialist countries to elaborate an ideal model for the comprehensive improvement of Mongolian society. At the same time, it was stressed that the new organization intends to promote the strengthening of mutual understanding and collaboration between party and people in every possible way.

The aims and tasks of the front, judging by its initiators' statements, chime closely with the call made recently by the MPRP Central Committee Politburo in its open letter to party members and the entire Mongolian people for the consolidation of all social forces in the country. The creation of the front should clearly be seen as a kind of positive reaction from the public to this appeal.

The party, the letter published by the newspaper UNEN points out, wholly supports all constructive ideas and initiatives of mass origin which manifest a sincere desire and readiness to make a specific, creative contribution to the cause of perestroyka. However, the public is expressing natural alarm and dissatisfaction in connection with the fact that informal associations and societies have recently been resorting to dubious statements and to the dissemination of leaflets, appeals, and slogans of a confrontational nature. They are imposing their own opinion, which distorts party and state policy, on labor collectives and, particularly, on young people. Moreover, they have started putting forward demands for a change to the existing social system in the country.

In this connection the Politburo is warning the people that ill-considered, careless, or declarative approaches to questions of state and social development, empty promises, and manifestations of levity or panic are not conducive to perestroyka. On the contrary, they could lead us into a dead end and do irreparable damage to society's development and progress and, ultimately, to the people and the nation.

The losses and damage suffered by society during the one-man rule of the administrative-edict system were great, the letter stated. The party itself has made an objective and acute assessment of the former leadership's negative phenomena and errors. However, if, while criticizing the distortions of socialist principles that took place in the past, we indulge in a wholesale denial of the economic, social, and cultural values and spiritual wealth created by the people during the building of the new society, and if we display one-sided prejudice by depicting everything in a poor light, this will not only distract us from historical objectivity but is also likely to disorient the people as regards choosing the further course of development.

The lessons of history also warn us against blindly mimicking and imitating these processes when assessing the results of perestroyka processes in other socialist countries. Our perestroyka should have its own national face and be carried out on the basis of strict consideration for and analysis of our own historic conditions, potential, features, traditions, and customs. The MPRP will consistently struggle, together with the people, for the creation in the republic of humane and democratic socialism, and it expresses the confidence that party members and all working people will make a weighty contribution to this common cause, the Politburo's open appeal to the Mongolian people stresses in conclusion.

The judgments contained in it, which are imbued with concern for the country's future, attest—as does the emergence of a patriotic movement in defense of perestroyka—to the galvanization of sociopolitical life in the republic and make it possible to see even more clearly the acuteness and importance of the historic period it is living through.

Program for Restructuring Mongolian Army Noted

LD1002132690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 7 Feb (TASS)—TASS correspondent Kim Boldokhonov reports:

"The main sectors of activity of the Mongolian People's Army in the period of perestroyka," this is what the program document published in the ULAAN OD newspaper is called.

It envisions the improvement of the structure and organization of the Mongolian People's Army on the basis of a single, scientifically based policy, the aim of which is to attain qualitative changes in the Armed Forces. The renewal of the activities of the People's Army, it says in it, is imbued with the higher interests of the fatherland, with the provision of guarantees of the peace and freedom of the Mongolian people who are implementing perestroyka in all spheres of the life of society and with the striving to aid, with all the means at its disposal, the implementation of the immutably peaceful foreign policy of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party and the Mongolian People's Republic. The program has been discussed in military divisions and formations and by veterans of the Mongolian People's Army and has been approved by the collegiate of the Ministry of Defense of the Mongolian People's Republic and by the political administration of the Mongolian People's Army.

It is stressed in the document that the Mongolian People's Republic has since the day of its birth always resolved defense issues with the support and aid of the Soviet people. It will continue in the future to develop these good traditions as well, making use of new, contemporary forms of close interaction.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Ryzhkov, Delegation Conclude Visit to Thailand

Rogachev Confers With Minister

LD1202225190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1311 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Bangkok, 12 Feb (TASS)—A meeting has taken place here between Igor Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, and Sitthi Sawetsila, Thailand's minister of foreign affairs, in the framework of the official visit to Thailand by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

During their conversation, certain practical issues of Soviet-Thai relations were examined, in particular the opportunities for expansion of cooperation of the two countries in the international arena.

During discussion of the Cambodian problem, both sides stressed the need for the speediest end to fighting in Cambodia and the importance of holding a regional meeting in Jakarta within the framework of the Paris conference. The sides consider a return to power in Cambodia by the Khmer Rouge regime impermissible.

Agreement was reached on continuing the political dialogue at the level of the heads of the foreign ministries.

King Receives Ryzhkov

LD1202123590 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] In Bangkok, there have been talks between visiting head of Soviet Government Nikolay Ryzhkov and Prime Minister of Thailand Chatchai Chunhawan. Ryzhkov was also received by the king of Thailand. The Soviet prime minister likewise met with the country's businessmen. Joint documents have been signed during the visit. One of them provides for the delivery of Soviet cotton to Thailand in exchange for garments. Speaking at a news conference, Nikolay Ryzhkov expressed satisfaction with his trip. It was the first visit to Thailand of such a high-ranking Soviet official. He will also go to Australia and Singapore.

Prime Minister, Ryzhkov Meet

LD1202144790 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 12 Feb 90

[By TASS special correspondents Vadim Talanov and Boris Chekhonin]

[Text] Bangkok February 12 TASS—Talks were held today between visiting Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Thai counterpart Chatchai Chunhawan.

The talks, in which officials from both sides took part, were preceded by a one-to-one meeting.

The two prime ministers exchanged views on the state of affairs in their countries, considered bilateral Soviet-Thai relations and discussed topical international problems of mutual concern.

Ryzhkov and Chunhawan noted the intensification of Soviet-Thai relations in recent years and with one accord favoured their further development and the broadening and deepening of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Thailand in various fields on the principles of equality, respect for each other's interests, non-interference, and mutual benefit.

The sides emphasised their mutual desire for further development of political dialogue, including on a high level, and broader contacts between the legislative bodies of the two countries.

The discussion of Soviet-Thai economic cooperation figured importantly during the talks. It was pointed out that economic cooperation, despite its acceleration recently, still lags behind the two sides' potentialities.

The two prime ministers considered some specific projects that could lend substantial dynamism to the state of affairs in this field, including that in the process of the Soviet Union's and Thailand's more active involvement in the development of economic ties in the region.

The two sides expressed mutual readiness to contribute to broadening contacts between members of the two countries' business communities, exchanges of business information and other forms of cooperation with a view to more fully utilising reserves that are being created by the Soviet economic reform and the rapid economic development of Southeast Asian countries.

The talks revealed the identity or similarity of the two sides' positions on many problems, and the sides expressed readiness to contribute to deepening the process of relaxation of tension, the strengthening of international security and the building of a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world.

It was recognised that the principles of new political thinking have prompted a transition from confrontation to dialogue and peaceful cooperation between countries with different social systems.

Chunhawan noted the great importance of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and of new political thinking not only to the progressive development of the USSR but also its closer and more dynamic relations with other states and the improvement of the international situation.

He welcomed the results of the Mediterranean shipboard summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush and positive changes in Soviet-American relations.

The two prime ministers noted that the overall warming of the international political climate had not bypassed the Asia-Pacific region, where headway is also observed towards an improvement of the political climate and settlement of existing conflicts.

A common agreement was expressed about the need to redouble efforts in order to further ease military tension.

The two sides favoured larger-scale development of trade and economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region through strengthening an open system of international trade and recognising the socio-economic diversity of states and development of the entire region.

When discussing the situation in Southeast Asia, the two sides paid special attention to the state of and prospects for a settlement of the Cambodian problem.

Having expressed concern over the dangerous development of events in Cambodia following the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops, Ryzhkov and Chunhawan called for an immediate cessation of hostilities and resumption of the negotiating process at all levels in order to achieve a comprehensive political solution.

Within this context the sides welcomed the intensification of diplomatic efforts of various countries towards a solution to the Cambodian issue.

Soviet-Thai documents were signed later in the day.

These are as follows:

A protocol on the implementation of the inter-governmental agreement on scientific and technical cooperation and the setting up of a working group for science and technology,
A programme for cultural and scientific exchanges between the Soviet and Thai Governments for 1990-1991,
an inter-governmental agreement on mutual provision of land plots in Bangkok and Moscow for the construction of the buildings of Soviet and Thai Embassies respectively.

Ryzhkov Speaks at Luncheon

LD1202144190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Bangkok, 12 Feb (TASS)—Here is the text of the speech given in reply by Nikolay Ryzhkov, who is on an official visit here, at a luncheon here today, arranged in his honor by the Kingdom of Thailand's Cabinet. He said:

"First of all I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Chatchai Chunhawan and to the Thai Government for its invitation to visit Thailand.

The good relations between our two countries have a history more than a century old and are immersed in rich traditions. The old Russia had great respect and liking for Siam, which was able, in the complicated political situation which arose in Indochina at the end of the 19th century, to defend its independence and national sovereignty. Here it is appropriate to produce a piece of historical evidence—an instruction from the Russian Government to its first envoy to Siam, A. Olarovskiy, in which it is stressed that all his activities—and I quote—must carry the mark of benevolent attention, and meet halfway that sincerity and friendliness which Siam places at the basis of its relations with Russia. Likewise, they must not have any mercenary motives or efforts to extort any kind of advantages.

In its basis such an approach is characteristic of the Soviet Union's policy in relation to Thailand, which is invariably determined by the principles of equality and respect for sovereignty and mutual interests. But today conditions are arising for our countries to go further along the path of strengthening our traditions of friendship, fill our relations with specific substance, broaden mutually advantageous economic links, cultural and scientific exchanges, and enter into active cooperation in the search for solutions for a whole series of topical problems which concern people throughout the whole world.

The present visit, the first to Thailand by the USSR Council of Ministers chairman in the almost half century of diplomatic relations between our countries, is taking place in a time of truly historic changes.

In the framework of perestroyka's political course, revolutionary changes are being carried out in all areas of public life in the Soviet Union. These are taking the form of a search for ways leading toward opening up the enormous material, spiritual, and intellectual potential which our country possesses, and toward directing it to benefit all the peoples inhabiting it. Perestroyka is a renewal of the whole of our life, democratization, and establishment of openness and glasnost. The ideas and decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that took place a few days ago show that one is facing a sharp turning point in the history of our party and of the whole of Soviet society, the essence of which is the consistent deepening of the process of democratic reforms.

Undoubtedly, perestroyka is our internal business. Perestroyka is essential for our people, and whatever difficulties arise before us we believe they will be overcome, for we have no alternative to it. But other peoples, all the world community, will also benefit from its success, since perestroyka is also a new political thinking in international affairs. It is coming to be expressed in the acknowledgement of the priority of values common for all mankind and in the course of democratization and de-ideologization of international relations, and in a search for a balance of all states' interests.

Today we can see the first practical results of approaching international problems from positions of the new thinking.

Trust is becoming more widely established in international relations, the prolonged "cold war" period has been brought to an end after bringing much misfortune upon mankind, and the enormous tension caused by confrontation between the two mighty military-political blocs is gradually subsiding. The incipient process of deepening mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States has already allowed the first steps to be taken in genuine disarmament.

Today's world is still not free of danger, of course. The nuclear threat remains, and the flames of regional conflicts have not been extinguished. New and previously nonexistent dangers are also coming to confront the whole of mankind: environmental pollution, depletion of irreplaceable resources, uneven development, the need to form international economic relations of a new kind that will make it possible to avert the threat of economic destabilization and to create conditions in which regions lagging behind in their development could recover.

Issues concerning mutual relations between individual countries, including mutual relations between the Soviet Union and Thailand, cannot be seen outside the context of these historic times, in isolation the imperatives of our age. The new conditions also present us with new opportunities, while at the same time setting tough tasks.

The most important condition for promoting these opportunities and for seeking necessary solutions is the presence of good will and the sincere desire to deepen and enrich our relations. And this has surfaced today in the course of the talks and conversations held when both sides expressed their interest in developing the whole range of relations between the USSR and Thailand.

We stated that it is expedient to strive for the expansion of our trade and economic ties in traditional directions, and at the same time to embark upon mastering new spheres that have opened up in the USSR in the process of economic reforms, enabling broad business contacts to be established between firms and industrial companies of our countries for the more extensive development of joint entrepreneurial activity.

Analysis of, albeit, the still very meager examples of this sort of activity, confirms that various reasons for mutual interest may be found as may suitable ways of implementing the various projects. I should like once more to stress that, for its part, the Government of the Soviet Union will provide assistance to those representatives of Thailand's business circles who seek an expansion in cooperation, and intends to create conditions favorable to this as economic reform continues to proceed.

As we understand it, the dynamic development of Thailand's economy presupposes the strengthening of the basic industries and the creation of a suitable industrial infrastructure. With its great experience and up-to-date technology the Soviet Union can play a part in constructing facilities for power engineering, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy, rail transport, and gas industries. Our country's design, trading, and industrial organizations would be prepared to participate in several such projects in Thailand.

Considerable reserves for developing business relations also exist in the scientific-technical sphere. The results of many design projects carried out in the USSR could serve as a basis for setting up promising new production units, including those in the form of joint enterprises. We hope that today's signing of the protocol on the founding of a Soviet-Thai commission on scientific-technical cooperation will help make joint work in this field a practical proposition.

There can be no doubt that the expansion of Soviet-Thai trade and economic relations will bring material benefit to both countries and, at the same time, as the creation of livelier contacts in the spheres of culture, sport and tourism, will bring them still closer together, strengthen mutual trust and help our interaction on the international scene.

The Soviet Union and Thailand are situated in the same part of the world—the Asian-Pacific region. Many people consider that this will become the "region of the 21st century." And there are serious reasons for this. But for this to happen, one condition must be realized: Stability and lasting peace must be ensured here. So far, the picture is a somewhat contradictory one. The region is saturated with weapons, including nuclear weapons, and hotbeds of dangerous tension remain.

Therefore, we must make an effort and try to change the situation in such a way that all the states of this vast area may, as soon as possible, feel the positive results of the disarmament process which has begun. The Asian countries have both the goodwill and a lot of experience in shaping the norms of civilized international contacts which exclude violence.

The improvement in the overall political climate would undoubtedly be promoted by normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia, and above all the final resolution of the Cambodian problem. We welcome Thailand's active participation in attempts to unravel this knot of tension. Mr. Prime Minister, your call for Indochina to be turned from a "battlefield into a trading zone" can be put into practice and this is mutually connected with a settlement in Cambodia.

Our approach to the Asian-Pacific region problems was mapped out in the well-known Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives. We believe that the arrangement of a political dialogue, trade, and economic cooperation between all states situated here, based on equal rights and of mutually benefit, will be a reliable guarantee for the elimination of the military threat and for the improvement of the situation in Asia, including its southeastern part. This is a true path toward the establishment of trust and mutual understanding which will not only favorably affect the harmonization of the whole network of relations in the Asian-Pacific region but also promote the further development of positive elements in international life as a whole.

Let me express the hope that the frank, substantive, and constructive exchange of views we have held will help deepen mutual understanding, raising the level of cooperation between our countries and peoples in the interest of strengthening security and trust in the Asian-Pacific region and beyond its frontiers.

Mr. Prime Minister, let me wish you, Mrs. Chunhawan, and all those present, good health and success, and peace and prosperity to the friendly Thai people.

Thank you for your attention.

Joint Communique Released

LD1202180590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1612 GMT 12 Feb 90

["Text" of Soviet-Thai joint communique released in Bangkok on 12 February 1990]

[Text] Bangkok, 12 feb (TASS)—N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, paid an official visit to Thailand 11-12 February 1990 at the invitation of Major General Chatchai Chunhawan, the Thai prime minister.

During the visit the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers was received by His Majesty King Phumiphon Adunyadet.

N.I. Ryzhkov and Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan held meetings and talks which were held in a friendly and constructive atmosphere.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were: S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.L. Malkevich, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; A.V. Valkov, USSR ambassador to Thailand; and L.A. Chizhov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Administration for Countries of the Pacific Ocean and Southeast Asia: On the Thai side - Phong Sarasin, deputy prime minister; Sitthi Sawetsila, minister of foreign affairs; Subin Pinkhayan, minister of commerce; Prachuap Chaiyasan, minister of science, technology and energy; Mana Rattanakoset, minister of education; Panya Singsakda, secretary general at the Prime Minister's Office; Kasemsamosom Kasemsi, permanent secretary for foreign affairs; and Manatphat Chuto, Thai ambassador to the USSR.

A wide range of international and regional problems of mutual interest, as well as issues of bilateral relations, were discussed.

The sides noted that the visit by the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers was a reflection of the good relations which are developing between the Soviet Union and Thailand. This visit served not only as a stimulus to the strengthening of existing ties, but it also contributed to expanding the scale and areas of cooperation between the two countries.

The participants in the talks stressed the great significance of the visits to the USSR by the Thai prime minister in April 1979 and May 1988. They also noted the exchange of visits at ministerial level, which had been stepped up in recent years and which served further to strengthen mutually beneficial cooperation in various fields. A particular role among these was played by the visit to Thailand in March 1987 by E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and the visit to the Soviet Union in May of the same year by Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila, the Thai minister of foreign affairs.

N.I. Ryzhkov spoke of the current stage of perestroyka in the USSR, the course of political and economic reforms, and the development of the process of democratization and glasnost. Chatchai Chunhawan expressed his sincere wish for success in the implementation of the Soviet program of perestroyka.

Noting the impressive achievements of Thailand in the area of socioeconomic development, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers wished the government and people of Thailand further progress and prosperity.

Both sides welcomed the improvement in bilateral relations in recent years, and confirmed their efforts for further broadening and deepening them on the principles of equality, respect for each other's interests, noninterference, and mutual advantage.

The two countries' heads of governments expressed satisfaction with the results of the first joint Soviet-Thai commission on trade, which met 12 and 13 October 1989, and was aimed at increasing the volume of bilateral trade and creating conditions for strengthening cooperation in this and related areas. They also called on all interested organizations and enterprises to speed up the practical implementation of agreements already reached. The reciprocal opinion was expressed that the joint commission is a useful forum for assisting the development of economic partnership in the intersts of both countries by realizing the possibilities which are opening up in connection with perestroyka in the Soviet economy, and the accelerated diversification and technical progress in the Thai economy.

Ways and means for further facilitating contacts between business circles in the two countries were examined.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and the Thai prime minister agreed to continue assisting cooperation and exchanges in the fields of culture, sport, and tourism, including suitable measures within the competence of the USSR Committee of Youth Organizations and the Thai National Youth Bureau. The mutual conviction was expressed that such exchanges will aid better mutual understanding of the two countries' peoples. In this connection, both sides noted with satisfaction the mutual interest of TASS and the Thai Information Agency in arranging cooperation in the area of information exchange.

The participants in the talks positively evaluate the regular consultations between senior officials of the two countries' Ministries of Foreign Affairs, which are held in accordance with the accord on bilateral consultations signed between the USSR and the Kingdom of Thailand in May 1988 and maintain continuous political dialogue between both countries.

The following documents were signed during the visit:

—A protocol on implementing the accords on scientific and technical cooperation between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand of 17 May 1988 and on establishing a joint Soviet-Thai commission on scientific and technical cooperation;

—An accord on providing plots for situating embassies between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand;

—A program for cultural and scientific exchanges between the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand for 1990-1991.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and the Thai prime minister welcomed the current easing of tension in international relations. It creates favorable conditions for tackling global and regional problems. Recently a tendency has taken shape of going over from confrontation to dialogue and to interaction among countries with different social systems. The new climate in the world opens up for the international community a unique opportunity for entering an era of peace and fruitful cooperation.

The Thai prime minister highly appraised the results of the 2-3 December 1989 meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States. He expressed the view that continuation of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue would be conducive to easing tension and would facilitate a deepening of mutual understanding and cooperation among all states. The Thai side approves of the USSR's and United State's efforts to conclude a treaty on a 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, to limit other types of arms, and to use political dialogue as a means of solving problems.

At the request of the head of the Government of Thailand, the USSR Council of Ministers chairman elucidated the Soviet Union's position with regard to the recent changes in Eastern Europe. having emphasized that they are based on a recognition of the right of each people to freedom of choice, respect of sovereignty of states, and impermissibility of interference in their internal affairs.

N.I. Ryzhkov informed Chatchai Chunhawan of the course of the implementation of the Soviet Union's initiatives concerning the Asian-Pacific Ocean region, put forward in M.S. Gorbachev's speeches in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk. The sides were unanimous that it is essential to search for ways to weaken military tension in this region and to facilitate the development of a negotiating process on a bilateral and multilateral basis to discuss topical problems.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers confirmed that the Soviet Union supports the ASEAN idea that a peace, freedom and neutrality zone should be set up in Southeast Asia, and that a nuclear-arms-free zone should be formed as part of it.

The head of the Soviet Government welcomed the Thai prime minister's call for Indochina to be turned from "a battlefield to a zone of peace, and a zone with a prospering market," because it would facilitate the creation of a more favorable climate for a peaceful political settlement of the Cambodian problem.

Both sides emphasized the pressing necessity of solving as speedily as possible the problem of Cambodia, which makes it more complex to maintain peace and stability in south-east Asia, and impedes a normal development of useful interaction and cooperation among the states in the region.

The Soviet side duly appraised the initiative of the Thai prime minister, who called for a resumption of talks between the Cambodian sides and the interested states. In this context both leaders express readiness to act in a manner that is conducive toward holding an informal meeting in Jakarta on the Cambodian problem within the Paris Conference framework.

Chatchai Chunhawan noted the constructive efforts of the Soviet Union, one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, aimed at a political settlement of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

The sides think that the initiative by Australia with regard to strengthening the role of the United Nations in resolving the Cambodian problem, and also the results of the recent meeting in Paris of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, give a new impetus to the negotiating process toward a Cambodian settlement.

The head of the Soviet Government reacted positively to the Thai leadership's line for the development of good-neighborliness and mutually advantageous cooperation with Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia, contributing to the creation of a favorable atmosphere for setting up peaceful coexistence between all states in southeast Asia and ensuring stability in the region.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and Thailand's prime minister, having discussed the development of the situation in Afghanistan and in the Near East, expressed the hope that these regional conflicts will be settled by political means, while respecting the wishes of all interested sides.

The participants in the talks stated their intention to continue cooperation within the framework of the UN organization and other international forums. They expressed full support for the efforts of the UN secretary general to solve international conflicts.

The two heads of the government examined the present international economic situation. They expressed a common point of view that in view of mutual interdependence in the world today, all states should cooperate for the purpose of mutual advantage. Both sides favor eliminating the practice of protectionism and other artificial trade barriers, which exert a destabilizing influence upon world economic ties.

Chatchai Chunhawan provided information about the results of the minister-level conference on Asian-Pacific Ocean cooperation held in Canberra in November 1989. The USSR and Thailand favor the development of broad trade and economic cooperation in the region based on a free and open system of international trade.

The two sides expressed the conviction that the visit of the head of the Soviet Government to Thailand, the first such visit in the history of Soviet-Thai relations, represented an important milestone in the process of expanding the entire gamut of relations between the two countries.

N.I. Ryzhkov invited the Thai prime minister to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at a mutually acceptable time. The invitation was received with gratitude.

The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers expressed sincere gratitude to the prime minister, the government, and people of Thailand for the warm reception and cordial hospitality that had been extended to him and his entourage.

Delegation Heads to Australia

LD1202223590 Moscow TASS in English 2212 GMT 12 Feb 90

[By TASS special correspondents Vadim Talanov and Boris Chekhonoin]

[Text] Bangkok, February 12 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov today held an important meeting with prominent representatives of the business community here. During the meeting, a programme of implementation of the agreement on cooperation between the Soviet Chamber of Industry and Commerce and the Thai Trade Council. [sentence as received]

Ryzhkov and representatives of the country's private economic sector discussed ways to fully utilize the two countries' potentials in order to raise their trade and economic relations to a higher level.

At a news conference here Ryzhkov was asked numerous questions about political and economic transformations in the Soviet Union, the forthcoming congress of the Soviet Communist Party and elections to local bodies of power.

Speaking about the Soviet Union's foreign policy in the region, Ryzhkov stressed the practical significance of Mikhail Gorbachev's Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives for strengthening peace and creating the climate of confidence and trust in the Asian-Pacific region.

Ryzhkov thanked Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, the government and the people of Thailand for the warm welcome and hospitality. He expressed satisfaction with the fact that the two countries did everything possible to make the Soviet prime minister's first official visit to Thailand a truly businesslike, constructive meeting.

The official visit of the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR to Thailand ended. In Bangkok Airport the Soviet guest was seen off by Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, members of the government, foreign ambassadors to Thailand, including Soviet Ambassador A. Valkov.

Nikolay Ryzhkov left Bangkok for an official visit to Australia at the invitation of the Australian Government.

Delegation Opens Visit to Australia 13 Feb

Australian Minister on Visit

LD1102132490 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 11 Feb 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Voronin]

[Text] Melbourne February 11 TASS—"The forthcoming visit of Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov to Australia is a logical followup on the already established exchange of high-level delegations between the two countries," Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade Gareth Evans said in an interview with TASS and Soviet television today.

Evans stressed that such an exchange has been particularly intensified after 1987, when Prime Minister Robert Hawke of Australia visited Moscow.

He singled out the significance of the fact that Ryzhkov is paying this visit in the period of important events in the Soviet Union when he shoulders the bulk of the load to restructure the Soviet economy.

Evans said that the visit by the head of the Soviet Government at such a responsible moment was a great honour to Australia and the entire region as a whole.

From the Australian point of view, this visit is of an immense importance, Evans said. It will add weight, depth and substance to bilateral relations. These relations have been successfully developing over many years but there are opportunities now to improve them still more.

Evans said that Australia wanted to develop bilateral ties, tapping new areas of economic cooperation, was ready for interaction in politics and not only in regional problems but also in tackling issues of world importance such as the elimination of chemical weapons, Antarctica, etc. The visit will allow a movement forward in solving these issues.

Evans believes that what is taking place in the Soviet Union now is of tremendous importance to the whole world and will inevitably affect the Asia-Pacific region. The scaling down of tension in East-West relations will undoubtedly help enhance security and defuse the situation in northern Pacific, he said.

A new and more secure situation will, possibly, form in south-eastern Asia and in the Pacific region as well. It is important to look forward and search for ways to stabilise the situation in that part of the world in the new and by far more auspicious atmosphere, which is currently shaping up.

The liberalisation of the Soviet economy and moves aimed at a deeper integration in the Asia-Pacific region, especially through developing the Soviet Far East, are of major importance to our region and Australia is ready to play an active role in this process, Evans emphasised.

Evans regards prospects for developing bilateral relations as excellent. Six important agreements, part of which on humanitarian cooperation and others on updating Soviet-Australian economic and political ties, will be signed during Ryzhkov's visit. All this is very important, Evans said.

Trade between the two countries now amounts to about a billion Australian dollars.

"We believe that the volume of trade can be steeply increased thanks to changes in the Soviet Union. Our relations have a bright future. Australia can offer a lot to the Soviet market, and not only its staple farm products but also high-tech goods, equipment for the communications and food industries—all that is sorely needed to develop the Soviet economy," Evans said.

Ryzhkov Arrives With Entourage

LD1302023390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0210 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Text] Melbourne, 13 February (TASS)—N.I. Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, who is on a trip around the countries of the Asia-Pacific region, arrived in Melbourne today.

At Tallamarin Airport he was met by Australian Prime Minister R. Hawke; G. Evans, minister for foreign affairs and trade; and J. Cain, governor of the State of Victoria.

Ye. M. Samoteykin, ambassador of the USSR to Australia, was among the welcoming party.

Usmanov Leads Parliamentarians on Hanoi Visit

'Friendly Visit' Under Way

LD1002043890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1332 GMT 9 Feb 90

[Text] Hanoi, 9 Feb (TASS)—A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation arrived in Hanoi today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV] National Assembly. It is led by G.I. Usmanov, USSR people's deputy and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The delegation is made up of USSR People's Deputies N.V. Britvin, A.M. Yemelyanov, V.A. Kiseleva, V.P. Maslin, and K.M. Moldobasanov.

The Soviet parliamentarians were met in the Vietnamese capital by Vu Oanh, deputy of the SRV National Assembly and secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, and other officials. Later in the day the delegation was received by Le Quang Dao, chairman of the National Assembly and deputy chairman of the SRV State Council. In the evening a reception of given on behalf of the Vietnamese parliament in honor of the Soviet visitors.

Delegates Meet SRV Officials

PM1202155390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Favor of Deepening Ties"]

[Text] Hanoi, 10 Feb—During talks here, USSR and SRV parliamentarians advocated the need to restructure Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation in the economy and other areas and rid it of all the stagnant elements preventing an increase in the effectiveness of bilateral ties. The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation at the talks was headed by USSR People's Deputy G.I. Usmanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, while the SRV National Assembly delegation was headed by Vu Oanh, assembly deputy and Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee secretary.

The Vietnamese side informed its Soviet colleagues about progress in implementing the course of renewing all areas of the Republic's life which was put forward at the Sixth CPV Congress.

The leader of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation pointed out in his speech that Soviet people are sincerely delighted by their Vietnamese friends' successes along the path of renewing society. He said that without doubt they are helping to increase the prestige of the CPV, which is creatively resolving, with consideration for its country's specific nature, tasks of socialist building which, in many respects, are new to it. G.I. Usmanov informed the Vietnamese side of the main problems encountered in the USSR during perestroyka's current phase, as well as the decisions made at February's CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The participants in the talks voiced a high assessment of the two countries' interaction in the international arena and advocated boosting the effectiveness of interparliamentary ties for the sake of deepening mutual understanding among peoples.

Near East & South Asia

Vorontsov Discusses Israeli Immigration Policy

LD1202184490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Today in Moscow Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, held a news conference devoted to Israel's actions in settling immigrants in the occupied territories. Comrade Vorontsov classified these actions as very serious and affecting Middle East security. Comrade Vorontsov went on to say in particular:

[Begin Vorontsov recording] The Soviet Government has adopted a decision to submit to the Security Council the issue of making an urgent examination of Israel's unlawful activity regarding the settlement of the occupied territories. We have received explanations to our inquiries and our protests from the Israeli Government to the effect that the Israeli Government is not forcing anyone to settle in the occupied territories and that each immigrant who arrives in Israel, just like a citizen of Israel, is free to choose his place of residence where he desires.

This official explanation convinced us of the fact that the Israeli Government is consciously violating the clauses of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which prohibits occupying powers from settling on occupied territory individuals who do not belong to its population. Israel is a signatory to that convention. Often they say that the Soviet Union should undertake decisive action and ban the emigration of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality to Israel. At the present time we are carrying out a broad democratization of Soviet legislation, and this also applies to legislation related to exit from the Soviet Union and entry into the Soviet Union. Therefore, in our opinion, one cannot examine the issue of the settlement by other individuals of the territories occupied by Israel with the center of gravity being placed on the fact that the Soviet Union should take some kind of prohibitive action. It seems to us that under the conditions of current Israeli policy, it is not desirable for the United State to hold up the process of allowing immigrants from the Soviet Union the right of entry into the United States. And we shall hope that the United States will take all the necessary measures in the future so that those who wish to go to the United States receive the opportunity to do so swiftly and do not have to wait for more than a year as is sometimes the case at the present time. [end recording]

In conclusion, Yuliy Mikhaylovich Vorontsov answered numerous questions put by journalists at the news conference.

Soviet Official Comments on Jewish Emigration

JN1102123090 Kuwait AL-ANBA' in Arabic 9 Feb 90 pp 1, 26

[Salam Musafir dispatch from Moscow]

[Text] Oleg Peresypkin, rector of the Diplomatic Academy and member of the General Secretariat of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, has stated that he agrees with His Highness the Amir of Kuwait, chairman of the Fifth Session of the Islamic Conference Organization, that settling Jews from the Soviet Union or any other country in the occupied Arab territories is a flagrant violation of the Palestinian Arab rights, as stipulated by international laws and norms. He called on the Arabs to reconsider their international policy and urged them to bring pressure to bear on the United States vis-a-vis the subject of settling the immigrants. He stressed that the reason for the influx of immigrants from his country is the current economic crisis in the Soviet Union.

In a statement to AL-ANBA', Professor Peresypkin added that his country denounces the Israeli authorities' measure and called on the Arab and Islamic countries to coordinate with the Soviet Union and international organizations and bodies in order to put an end to this violation.

The Soviet diplomat said: We hope that our positions are clear to the Arab friends because the Soviet Union is the Arabs' ally against Jewish settlement in the occupied territories. He indicated that the Jewish immigrants should understand that the popular intifadah in the occupied territories will be a disturbing element for them and they will not enjoy the stability for which they went there. He said: Giving greater momentum to the intifadah will curb the influx of immigrants, and it is important to indicate in this regard that there should be programmed propaganda work to be prepared by and coordinated with the Arab countries in order to acquaint the Jewish immigrants in all parts of the world with the real situation under which they intend to live.

Peresypkin attributed the increase in Jewish emigration from his country to occupied Palestine to the current economic and social crisis in the Soviet Union, and said: The fabricated rumors about massacres being prepared for Soviet Jews have played their role in inflaming the desire to emigrate. He held those whom he called extremists responsible for this campaign. He said the Soviet authorities have not and will not allow any acts of violence against Jewish citizens and that fabricating such rumors serves only the Zionist aims.

Peresypkin called on the Arab countries to reconsider their international relations and said it is appropriate for the Arabs today to pressure the United States into preventing Israel from continuing its plans. He added: Our government has communicated to the United States and Israel our unequivocal rejection of the Israeli plan to settle immigrants in the Palestinian territories, and we will coordinate steps with the PLO and Arab governments in order to place the international organizations and the United Nations before their responsibilities in this regard.

He said: This subject will certainly be one of the major points Shevardnadze will discuss with his U.S. counterpart Baker during their current talks in Moscow. He stressed that his country is eager for the Palestinians and the Arabs in general, to understand the Soviet Union's position and efforts to establish peace in the Middle East. He said, however, that his country's authorities cannot stop granting travel visas to the Jews because the freedom of travel and emigration applies to all regardless of their nationality.

Shevardnadze Receives Afghan Ambassador

PM0502151790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 2 February, E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, received S.M. Gulabzoy, Afghan ambassador to the USSR.

A wide range of questions concerning Soviet-Afghan relations and a political settlement in Afghanistan were discussed during the conversation.

E.A. Shevardnadze dwelt in particular on cooperation between the two countries as regards achieving a universal political settlement in Afghanistan. He noted that the international community firmly advocates the peaceful resolution to the Afghan problem reflected in the relevant resolution of the 44th UN General Assembly session. In the light of this, the role of the UN and its general secretary is becoming increasingly significant in holding inter-Afghan dialogue. President Najibullah's plan, put forward at the ninth conference of nonaligned countries' heads of state and government in Belgrade, was a good basis for seeking paths toward a settlement.

S.M. Gulabzoy gave E.A. Shevardnadze details about the military and political situation in Afghanistan. This situation is characterized by growth in the authority and influence of the Afghan Government and President Najibullah himself, and increasing disorder in the armed opposition's camp, whose extremist elements continue to rely on methods of force and on barbarous terrorist attacks on Afghan towns and kishlaks. He noted that the Afghan Government is increasing its activity toward national conciliation and is securing an increasingly widespread positive response among the Afghan people, including many opposition field commanders.

The ambassador expressed the Afghan people's deep gratitude to the Soviet people for their moral and material support for their efforts to achieve peace on Afghan soil.

Afghan Official Discusses Prospects for Peace

LD1202122590 Moscow TASS in English 1210 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Kabul February 12 TASS—"The signing of the Geneva accords on Afghanistan gave us hope that peace would come to our war-ravaged country. However, no political solution of the Afghan problem was found during the year that has elapsed after the Soviet Union withdrew its troops from the country in keeping with these agreements. The hostilities are continuing. Pakistan and the United States, who have violated the Geneva agreements, bear full responsibility for this," TASS was told by Sultan 'Ali Keshtmand, Politburo member and chairman of the Executive Committee of the Council of Ministers of Afghanistan.

"The war," he stressed, "has a negative effect on the country's economic development. It has caused huge material and human losses, economic recession, shortage of food products and manufactured goods, as well as many other negative phenomena. We are compelled to spend 15 per cent of our gross national product on defence. But the national economy continues to make headway even in these most difficult conditions thanks to the government's efficient policy. Much attention is being paid to the private sector, which accounts for 80 percent of Afghanistan's economy. Suffice it to say that during the past 10 months we have issued licences for the creation of more than 40 various enterprises. Applications are being considered to open 64 more plants, factories and workshops.

"The operation of our gas fields was suspended more than a year ago. They will be recommissioned shortly. Much of the gas will be delivered to the USSR at world prices.

"Work has been completed on a 68-kilometre asphalted highway from Kabul to Bagram and the safety of goods transported by it from the port of Hayraton to the capital has been ensured. It cost the treasury 1.5 billion afghanis, but now the capital with its two million people, is adequately supplied with food and fuel. The current winter differed appreciably from the previous one due to the created stockpiles. Extremist attempts to strangle Kabul by an economic blockade have fallen through."

In conclusion the premier stressed the readiness of Afghanistan's leadership to do everything in order to secure the release of Soviet war prisoners who are still in rebel hands.

Proposed Negotiation Rekindles Hope in Sudan

EA1102090190 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 9 Feb 90

[From "World Events Today"]

[Text] Last Thursday [8 February] the SPLA [Sudanese People's Liberation Army] agreed to take part in the new negotiations proposed by Khartoum that will take place in Zaire. The official military representative said that a responsible delegation has been appointed for this purpose. This delegation is ready to leave for Zaire at any time. A reciprocal step is now awaited from the Khartoum government. After the war between the southern Sudanese and the government troops was renewed at the end of January, hope for peace in Sudan, which has been exhausted by war, was lost.

Now hope has been rekindled, says our commentator Eduard Babazade. If it is quickly realized that the bloodshed in Sudan will stop, the problems facing the country will disappear in the long run. I think the renewal of the war was brought about by the failure of the talks that took place in Nairobi in November last year, our commentator adds. The talks proved that the conflicting sides are pursuing only their interests while ignoring those of the country.

The two warring sides give much verbal support to ending the war that broke out in 1983. General 'Umar Hasan al-Bashir, the leader of the Revolution Command Council of Sudan, has reiterated many times the government's desire to liberate the country from the economic hardship it is in and to resolve peacefully the issue of southern Sudan.

Such statements have also been made by Colonel John Garang, the leader of the SPLA. I think that over the last few years, he has changed his conditions for holding talks. He has said that the objective of the front he is leading is to hold full peace talks and to call for a parliamentary conference. John Garang said the solution of the conflict is very much tied to the removal of the Muslim shari'ah law, which is in force in the country, and the liberation of southern Sudan.

He has added new conditions to these, including the allowing of activities by trade unions and political parties, freedom of the press and the freeing of political prisoners, estimated to number 13,000. Garang said that they are not fighting for the liberation of the southern region, but are struggling for the restructuring of Sudan.

However, the war between the north and the south, which costs half a million dollars a day, is still continuing. Libya, Ethiopia, and Uganda have directly or indirectly participated in the war. The weak economy of Sudan is suffering very serious hardship, from which it seems it cannot escape. From the southern regions alone, 3.5 million people have fled. The capital of Equatoria region, Juba, which is known as the second capital of Sudan, is besieged. Many innocent people are dying.

Pope John Paul II has called upon the Sudan Government and the armed rebels to guarantee the passage of food to needy people. Among the 300,000 people in Juba are 200,000 refugees. The steps to be taken in reconciling the northern and the southern people are designed to cool the situation prevailing in Sudan. The new talks to be mediated by Mobutu Sese Seko, the president of Zaire, cannot be delayed for one moment.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ministry Spokesman Welcomes Release of Mandela

MB1202202090 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman announced at a briefing in Moscow today that his country, among other nations, welcomed the release from detention on Sunday [11 February] of the ANC [African National Congress] leader, Nelson Mandela.

He emphasized that this step should have been taken long ago, and he voiced hope that the apartheid regime in South Africa would be done away with once and for all.

Kapitsa Praises Nelson Mandela's Release

MB1202214290 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 12 Feb 90

["Special program" featuring Mikhail Kapitsa, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries, and unidentified announcer; date and place not given; recorded Kapitsa remarks in Russian fading into English translation]

[Text] [Announcer] We continue a special program devoted to the release from jail of the leader of the African National Congress [ANC] of South Africa, Nelson Mandela. We have a speaker now, the chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With the Countries of Asia and Africa, Mikhail Kapitsa, a people's deputy of the USSR:

[Kapitsa] [Words indistinct] down today's changes in the policy of the ruling quarters of South Africa. Undoubtedly the warm winds of a general improvement in the international climate are progressive. Changes are taking place in that country, too. That is indicated by a (?full) number of reforms by the South African president, Frederik de Klerk. Another fine indication is the release from jail of the acknowledged leader of the ANC, Nelson Mandela. Now, after long years of waiting impatiently for that, one can say at last that this courageous man is free.

People in this country know well of the life and struggle of Nelson Mandela, although probably it is very difficult to draw a line between life and struggle in the destiny of that man, for he has dedicated his entire life to the struggle to end the criminal system of apartheid and to set up a democratic, multiracial South African state.

His first words after the release show that Nelson Mandela now, too, intends to stick to his stand of principle and will continue the struggle while his strength and health permit it still.

[Announcer] Mikhail Kapitsa adds this:

[Kapitsa] On this joyful occasion I have good reason to speak about Nelson Mandela's strength and health, which have been greatly depleted by the 27 years of imprisonment. Therefore, I personally have a mixed feeling of satisfaction that Nelson Mandela has been released, and of sadness. I am sad that this, one of the outstanding sons of South Africa, has spent the best part of his life in jail for his views.

From the bottom of my heart I congratulate Nelson Mandela on his release. I convey to him the warmest, friendly wishes from the Soviet Union. I wish him health and strength to carry out the dreams of his entire life about creating a new, democratic South Africa.

Valentinov on 'Obvious' Need for RSA Dialogue

MB0802190290 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Vladimir Valentinov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Unity in action has long been one of the basic principles of the African National Congress' [ANC] activities.

In the current situation in South Africa, the unity of action by all progressive forces is necessary more than ever before. The situation is complicated indeed. Strange as it may seem, it emerged after certain democratic changes in the country's political life proclaimed by President Frederik de Klerk. The ANC and the Communist Party, like other political organization, have been legalized. Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners are to be released shortly. Besides, President de Klerk has, on behalf of the government, voiced a readiness for talks with the representatives of the progressive forces.

It might seem that the situation in South Africa is going to stabilize and develop a trend toward greater democracy. However, as the general secretary of the South African Communist Party, Joe Slovo, who is also a member of the ANC leadership said, and quite correctly, the reforms announced by the president have lessened stability in the country, and the situation may deteriorate unless the government takes further steps to meet the demands of political opponents.

His fears are justified. The process of political reforms being carried out by President de Klerk and his government can be likened to the treatment of a famine victim, which is based on strictly rationed and timely feeding. This is a method tested over many centuries. I would like to hope that the hunger for democracy in South Africa will be quenched and that the first doses of the democratic food of President de Klerk's reforms will be followed by others, and in due time.

Meanwhile, views on the future march of events differ. The president failed to clear old doubts when he appeared on South African Television on Sunday [4 February] to announce that there was a need to preserve the state of emergency. Meanwhile, it is the state of emergency that has proved to be one of the chief obstacles on the way to peace talks so necessary to resolve South Africa's problems. The Pan-Africanist Congress is opposed to negotiation, saying that the government's reforms are insufficient.

However, the need for a dialogue is obvious. The sole alternative to a dialogue would be growing tension and confrontation and the worsening of the clashes. President de Klerk has recognized that. The ANC and the South African Trade Union Congress have the same opinion. This is the reason why they have called upon all democratic forces of South Africa to unite.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Reports Crash

PM1202164190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Helicopter Catastrophe"]

[Text] An air disaster 7 February resulted in the deaths of Major General A.E. Semenov and Senior Lieutenant A.M. Biryukov, a translator, who were part of a group of Soviet military experts in Ethiopia, as well as members of the helicopter crew Major S.A. Yarushnikov, Senior Lieutentant I.V. Tarasov, Senior Lieutenant P.I. Klimov, and V.N. Voloshchenko, a student.

A special commission, which is carrying out an investigation into the circumstances and causes of the air disaster, has been dispatched to the scene of the accident.

The USSR Defense Ministry expresses its condolences to the relatives and friends of those who died.

East Europe

TASS on German Reunification Issues

LD1202131690 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 12 Feb 90

[By TASS political observer Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow February 12 TASS—Everybody agrees that the problem of the unity of the German nation should be resolved by Germans themselves. It is Germans who are to make their choice and to decide the form of statehood, the date, the pace and the conditions for their reunification. This was confirmed by the results of the talks held here by West German Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl.

It is obvious that the reunification of two German states is inevitable. However, this process cannot develop all by itself, outside the framework of all-European development. This envisages, in the first place, that the security and interests of their neighbours and other European countries, as well as countries of other continents, should be taken into consideration. This means primarily the inviolability of borders formed as a result of the Second World War. Besides, the German rapprochement should not undermine positive results achieved in East-West relations. On the contrary, it should promote their deepening and development.

Along with the end to the cold war, the reunification of Germany, the activisation of the disarmament process and the creation of the all-European home, it will become unnecessary to preserve in their initial form the two opposing military-political organisations—NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The goals they set themselves during their early years will become meaningless. This is why it would be logical for a reunited German state to be outside these blocs, at least while they exist. This would strengthen confidence in Germany and consolidate peace in Europe.

Second, everything must be done so that the threat of fascism, the threat of another war, never again emanates from German soil. As for the German Democratic Republic, it has already taken measures to prevent it: With full agreement of all political parties and movements neo-Nazi organisations have been outlawed. In West Germany, however, the activities of neo-Nazis have still not been totally blocked. There should be no neo-Nazis in a united Germany. Measures should be taken for making peace the only thing coming from German soil, as Chancellor Kohl put it in Moscow.

Third, since Germans are to resolve the unity problem by themselves, there should be no attempts to interfere, to exert pressure or impose somebody else's opinion on them, let alone ultimatums or actions undermining the fundamentals of the present statehood. The process should develop peacefully on the basis of conscious, bilateral and voluntary accord. It is only in this atmosphere that one can really hope for due consideration to be taken of the interests of both the GDR and West Germany, without which the reunification process would be meaningless.

GDR Developments; FRG Republicans' Activities

PM1202165590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Undated Berlin dispatch by own correspondent V. Lapskiy: "GDR: Government's Concerns"]

[Text] A special committee for the disbandment of the national security department was created at the latest GDR Council of Ministers session.

Dossiers on 6 million GDR citizens have come into the hands of the newly created committee, an international news conference was told. One journalist's question as to whether the dossiers will be handed over to those on whom they were kept was answered in the negative: This would involve considerable administrative difficulties.

It was expected that the Council of Ministers would discuss the currency unification plan advanced by Bonn this week. But as H. Modrow told a correspondent for West Germany's ZDF television channel, the GDR Government has not received any official documents on this from the FRG.

The newspapers and television are reporting a political show staged at Checkpoint Charlie between West and East Berlin by West German "Republicans" leader Schoenhuber. A bus carrying a group of European Parliament deputies, including French extreme right leader Le Pen, approached the border. Schoenhuber attempted to cross the border but was stopped by GDR border guards. This was his second unsuccessful attempt to penetrate the Republic's territory.

A news conference organized by Schoenhuber was held in West Berlin the day before. He described the ban on the "Republicans'" activity in the GDR as "a game being played by Bonn and Pankow" (the former government district in the GDR capital). Pagel [name as transliterated], one of the leaders of the Republican Party in West Berlin, stated that, following the creation of a "Republicans" organization in Leipzig, there should also be similar organizations in other places. On Friday there will be a meeting of the Brandenburg "Republicans" organization, after which a city alliance of "Republicans" is expected to appear in the GDR capital. Will the ban imposed by the People's Chamber be effective?

Officer Comments on Relations With GDR Locals

PM1202120790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch: "Service Takes Its Course"]

[Text] Berlin—On the grounds of this unit of the Western Group of Forces, you don't get the feeling that you're abroad. There are barracks and administrative buildings painted an indeterminate color, a Board of Honor, the slogan "Glory to the CPSU," a red banner, and firs and birches seemingly specially imported from Russia. If the unit does differ from our home garrisons, it is in the particular bearing and smartness of the officers and men who, clearly, are constantly mindful of the fact that they are not at home.

Next year Lieutenant Colonel S.V. Fraltsev, chief of the unit's political department, said, the unit will celebrate its 50th anniversary. It started with a regiment which, during the war, went from the Volga to the center of Berlin—Alexanderstrasse—and became the last line of combat.

The unit is based in the historic region of Karlshorst. It was here in May 1945 that the last part of World War II was played out. The Surrender Museum is always busy, and buses bearing the military emblems of the United States, Britain, and France travel to it down Fritz Schmenkel Strasse.

I asked Sergey Vladimirovich whether events of recent months in the GDR had affected servicemen.

"No they haven't," he replied. "Previously the unit maintained direct contacts with the Berlin SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Bezirk Committee, but now these contacts no longer exist. On the other hand, contacts have been established with the Berlin City Council. We have also felt the cuts taking place in the National People's Army. Its political organs, with which we had comradely relations, have been abolished. Our friendship with certain units located in the GDR's capital, including the Friedrich Engels Regiment and border guards, has been maintained. We maintain constant links with the police headquarters—if there are accidents involving Soviet citizens in the city, they immediately contact the Soviet command—that is, us."

[Lapskiy] What form does the military command take?

[Fraltsev] With us it is informal, so to speak; it is headed by a battalion commander—Major Kapustin.

[Lapskiy] What are your relations with local organs of power like?

[Fraltsev] Excellent, as before. We hold subbotniks with the region's residents, and we help the population. Currently, as is well known, there are difficulties with the workforce in Berlin and in the GDR as a whole. People are asking us to help with transport, for instance, or—as was the case recently—we have been asked to demolish an old building that was threatening to collapse.

[Lapskiy] Each year a Friendship Day is held in your territory. Why will it not be held this year?

[Fraltsev] This day was held within the framework of Brotherhood in Arms Week. Why are we not staging the festival this year? It was usually visited by thousands of Berliners; entrance was free; our soldiers sang songs for our guests and demonstrated their sports skills, while the guests familiarized themselves with the unit's life and its combat hardware. The GDR's border with the FRG and West Berlin is now open. Anyone could visit, including extremists. We are scared of a provocation by neo-Nazis. As is well known, they recently defaced a monument and tombs containing the remains of Soviet soldiers in Treptow Park. They could do anything. The German-Soviet Friendship Society, with which we maintain good relations, was understanding about our decision.

[Lapskiy] Have there been provocations against the unit?

[Fraltsev] Not as yet. We are constantly on our guard.

[Lapskiy] Does the unit continue to guard the memorial to Soviet servicemen in the British zone of West Berlin?

[Fraltsev] There are 14 soldiers continually on guard there, we replace them once every 24 hours. In the past few years there have been no serious incidents on the territory of the memorial.

[Lapskiy] Do you maintain contacts with the allied units' command in West Berlin?

[Fraltsev] Yes, of course. Recently our relations have improved literally before our very eyes—especially with the Americans. We visit each other. Last month the commander of the American brigade was replaced. The new commander, Brigadier General Sankhou [name as transliterated], has invited our officers to get acquainted.

[Lapskiy] It is no doubt considered prestigious to serve with you?

[Fraltsev] Undoubtedly. Service in our unit is considered an honorable undertaking. But we also make high demands of our officers and men, and that applies to discipline, bearing, and military and political training.

Shevardnadze, Polish Envoy Discuss Relations

LD1102160390 Moscow International Service in Polish 1500 GMT 11 Feb 90

[Text] On 10 February Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs, recieved Stanislaw Ciosek, ambassador of the Polish Republic to the Soviet Union, at his own request.

During the conversation the Soviet side emphasized that relations between the Soviet Union and Poland are generally developing in a satisfactory fashion. Problems existing in the field of bilateral cooperation, both political and economic, are being examined in a joint effort. Both sides are undertaking practical steps to make contacts between the two countries more active. Intense contacts are continuing between the foreign ministries of both countries. This is an expression of the will of the Soviet Union and Poland to cooperate further in the international arena.

It was stated that the forthcoming official visit by Krzysztof Skubiszewski to the Soviet Union will create good opportunity to discuss Soviet-Polish relations in their entirety and to exchange opinions on current international issues.

Kwasniewski Views Role as SDRP Chairman

90UI0342A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 3 Feb 90 p 3

[Report on telephone interview with Aleksandr Kwasniewski, chairman of Social Democracy of the Republic of Poland Main Council, by M. Botyan; date not given: "With a Clean Sheet"]

[Text] I have been personally acquainted with Aleksandr Kwasniewski for six years now. We met for the first time when Aleksandr had just started work as chief editor of the Polish youth paper SZTANDAR MLODYCH. Fate subsequently brought me into contact frequently with A. Kwasniewski, minister for youth affairs and chairman of the Committee for Youth Affairs and Sport, as a member of the Polish Council of Ministers. Working as the correspondent of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in this country, I interviewed the youngest minister on several occasions.

He was born Aleksandr in Gdansk in 1954. He graduated from Gdansk University. He is fluent in Russian, English, and German. He is married. He has a nine-year-old daughter. Last year the figure of A. Kwasniewski became even more noticeable on the stage of Polish political life following his active participation in the "Roundtable" meeting. A. Kwasniewski is an active theorist and developer of the model of the new party of forces of the left—Social Democracy of the Republic of Poland [SDRP]—which he came to head at the recent constituent congress.

[Botyan] Permit me first of all to congratulate you on your election to such a responsible office in the newborn party.

[Kwasniewski] Thank you!

[Botyan] What do you, as chairman of the party's Main Council, see as the primary, most urgent tasks?

[Kwasniewski] We need to get organized as quickly as possible. The former party is dissolved, our party is being created from scratch. There is a very great deal that we need to change in the people's modus operandi and way of thinking in order that the party be different from what it was previously. That it be modern, correspond to people's aspirations, and recognize their most pressing problems.

[Botyan] And how is admittance to the SDRP being organized?

[Kwasniewski] Party membership is being started from scratch. The conditions are the same both for members of the former party and for newcomers. Those joining must sign the party declaration.

[Botyan] How did you begin your first work day?

[Kwasniewski] With conversations with various people about how we can get the work of the new party going a little more quickly and about what needs to be done right away. We discussed how to leave the old track more quickly and abandon the old habits in order to boldly tackle the problems confronting us. They are largely comparable, I believe, with the problems being tackled by Mikhail Gorbachev. We all need perestroyka. But there are still many forces which gravitate toward the old times.

[Botyan] You are a young party leader. In your former work you put the emphasis on youth both by duty and by avocation, as they say. What do you think, will those who are called upon to decide the fate of the future Poland follow you today?

[Kwasniewski] The youth are our main hope. I meet very often with people of my own age, representatives of the country's younger generation. We find a common language. Many of them are linking their hopes with me as their contemporary also.

However, it should be remembered that we are creating a new party of forces of the left under incredibly complex economic and political conditions, when the movement of the left is not all that popular and when there has been a considerable decline in interest therein. It is understandable why. The left is being blamed for all the difficulties which our country is experiencing. We are called on to reanimate the movement of the left, as it were. And I believe in the possibility of this.

[Botyan] How does your party see its relations with the CPSU?

[Kwasniewski] We recently received congratulations from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We express to him our immense gratitude. We hope that the cooperation of our parties will serve our countries and our neighborhood well.

We have a common interest in the policy being pursued by Comrade Gorbachev. And we want his policy to succeed. Thanks to it alone have the changes occurred in East Europe.

I believe that Mikhail Gorbachev also has an interest in the success of Poland's forces of the left. If we really become a force to be reckoned with in Poland, this will prevent the existence of a monopoly of the right and also afford an opportunity for influencing the representatives of the movement of the left associated with the governing camp in our country.

[Botyan] How did your family take your promotion?

[Kwasniewski] With satisfaction and confusion at the same time. My family has a very good idea of what all this means to it.

[Botyan] Are you prepared, Comrade Chairman, to receive in the future a RABOCHAYA GAZETA journalist for a more substantive discussion?

[Kwasniewski] With pleasure. I would like, however, even now to convey my greetings to all the readers of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. I wish success for the processes of perestroyka in your country and their continued improvement.

Poland's Kwasniewski, Miller Thank Gorbachev

PM1202120590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Single Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Gratitude for Congratulations"]

[Text] A telegram addressed to M.S. Gorbachev has arrived from Aleksander Kwasniewski and Leszek Miller—chairman of the Supreme Council and general secretary of the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic Central Executive Committee, respectively—which expresses thanks for the congratulations sent in connection with their election to important posts in the Polish Social Democratic Party, and notes a desire to continue and develop cooperation between the Polish left-wing forces and the CPSU.

IZVESTIYA Covers Unrest in Kosovo

Protests Over Violence Cited

PM0902114990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Kosovo: Far From Overcoming the Crisis"]

[Text] Albania's ATA News Agency has reported that the Albanian Democratic Front has issued a statement on the events in Yugoslavia's Kosovo Autonomous Province.

The statement demands that the Yugoslav authorities immediately end their violence in Kosovo and lift the state of emergency there. It is in the interests of Yugoslavia itself and its stability and progress, the document points out, not to whip up a new wave of terror but to conduct a democratic dialogue so as to reach agreement with the Albanian population and ensure that they enjoy the same freedoms and democratic rights as Yugoslavia's other peoples. Albanians do not demand any privileged status for themselves, but they will not allow their rights to be infringed.

A normalization of the situation in Kosovo achieved through dialogue, tolerance, and observance of Albanians' human rights and freedoms will not only be in Yugoslavia's interests but will also make a definite contribution to the development of good-neighborly ties between Albania and the SFRY and to the positive development of the process in the Balkans, the Albanian Democratic Front statement points out.

Protest rallies are currently being held in many Albanian cities. Their participants are condemning the Yugoslav authorities' policy toward Kosovo's Albanian population.

Belgrade's Clampdown 'Justified'

PM0702094990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 FEb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch: "No to Civil War"]

[Text] Belgrade—The past two days have shown to what extent the measures taken against violence and terrorism in Kosovo Autonomous Province by the country's supreme organs were justified and necessary. These measures, in conjunction with efforts made by local social organizations and all sound forces, have made it possible to bring under control a situation that had reached a crisis point.

For the first time since 24 January—the beginning of mass demonstrations by extremists—the past 24 hours were peaceful everywhere. No hostile demonstrations or attacks by bandits on Serbs and Montenegrins were noted in any of the settlements. Peace and normality are returning to the streets of Pristina, capital of the province. Tension persists only on the Pristina-Skopje highway, as well as certain other roads where barricades were set up at night.

A federal government staff has started operating to monitor the Kosovo situation. It is headed by Ante Markovic, chairman of the government. The staff includes both of his deputies, the federal secretaries (ministers) of foreign affairs and national defense, and the general secretary of the Federal Executive Council. The government's position remains firm and uncompromising: The unity of a multinational state, the incipient processes of profound democratization in society, and economic and other reforms require protection by all possible legal means. Aleksandar Mitrovic, deputy chairman of the Federal Executive Council, made the following statement in the SFRY Assembly:

"During the past few hours and days, the government has been in constant contact with the SFRY Presidium, the supreme organs of Serbia and Kosovo, and the executive councils of all the republics. A united view on the Kosovo situation was successfully reached. The situation there is now even more serious than it was in March of last year, when separatists used firearms during mass demonstrations.

The deputy chairman of the federal government noted in particular that, thanks to resolute action, mass armed demonstrations by separatists throughout the province's territory were averted, and the general strike that was being prepared was also exposed. The aim of the strike, which had been on the point of starting in 12 places, was to block all channels of communication—the post office, the telegraph office, the telephone service, and other information systems, the highways, and the railways. Separatists only managed to block some highways in various directions for a short time. Railroad transport operated without disruption. Audacious terrorist attempts were made to provoke clashes with Serbs and Montenegrins living in Kosovo as well as with representatives of security forces. For this purpose, the extremists had at their disposal a "considerable arsenal of weapons," and they set themselves the task of turning the separate armed clashes that had begun in many populated areas into a bloody civil war. "But we forestalled the separatists and did not let them do this," Ante Markovic said. "And we will not let them do it in the future."

The next assembly session, including a discussion of the country's internal situation, has been announced for 7 February. It is being impatiently awaited, since the deputies are faced with the task of adopting important decisions concerning the latest events in the country, which has been shaken by powerful protest rallies against the divisive actions of separatists and in support of Serbia's and Yugoslavia's territorial integrity.

As TANJUG reports, the Federal Executive Council, noting the signs of improvement in the Kosovo situation, is turning attention to the importance of observing social order and calm there. It appealed to the population of other regions in Yugoslavia to refrain from mass rallies and demonstrations which would stir up tension and provoke incidents. In this difficult situation, the role of the mass media, whose objective reporting of events can promote the relaxation of tension or, on the other hand, make it more acute, was particularly noted.

Trial of Ceausescu Aides Evokes 'Surprise'

PM0602153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Volodin: "Sentence on Remembrance Day"]

[Text] Bucharest—The sound of bells gently ringing could be heard throughout Romania. In accordance with Orthodox tradition, the country was remembering the dead.

It is exactly 40 days since the popular uprising, when the roads of the Romanian capital were drenched with the blood of shot demonstrators. There were requiems in all Orthodox churches in Romanian to mark Mourning Day. On that very day the Bucharest territorial military tribunal passed sentence on T. Postelnicu, I. Dinca, M. Manescu, and E. Bobu, former members or candidate members of the RCP [Romanian Communist Party] Central Committee Political Executive Committee.

The trial of the four people, accused of genocide, aiding and abetting the dictator, and wreaking violence on demonstrators in Timisoara, Bucharest, and other cities lasted a week. The court established that 689 people were killed and 1,200 were wounded during the revolutionary events of 22-31 December.

There was much surprise at the inadequate preparations for the trial. On the very first day certain variations between copies of the stenographic account of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee 17 December session, which discussed the question of the use of weapons against demonstrators in Timisoara, allowed former Internal Affairs Minister T. Postelnicu to accuse the court of falsification. Immediately after this statement an adjournment was announced and the trial did not resume until the next day.

The defendants' behavior at the trial varied. Not only I, but many of the people present in the courtroom had the impression that, despite the "four's" sudden use of terms like "dictator," "tyrant," and the "dictator's wife," at least two of the defendants—T. Postelnicu and M. Manescu—had chosen tactics whereby a person says too much, while saying nothing about himself. It was no accident, in my view, that the court had to call extra witnesses to finally substantiate the charge of genocide, which had seemed self-evident at first glance.

The Bucharest territorial military tribunal, in the name of the law, by a majority vote, sentenced defendants T. Postelnicu, I. Dinca, M. Manescu, and E. Bobu to life imprisonment, with confiscation of property and forfeiture of military rank, the court chairman announced. When the sentence had been read out, the defendants, aside from I. Dinca, said that they would be appealing.

Ammunition Explodes at CSSR Military Test Site

Compensation To Be Offered

PM1202114590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Single Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Ammunition Explosion"]

[Text] Prague, 7 Feb—Colonel S. Pohoral, spokesman of the CSSR Ministry of National Defense, told CTK today that a powerful explosion occurred at 1625 Central European Time on 6 February during a planned destruction of combat ammunition belonging to Soviet troops at the Libava military test site (Northern Moravia). There are no casualties.

A preliminary investigation by specialists from the Czechoslovak People's Army and the Soviet Army, the district public security department, and representatives of the local organs of power established that the explosion was due to a gross violation of safety rules. Some 500 antitank shells, 20 kg of artillery gunpowder, and 12 kg of TNT were due for destruction.

Spokesmen of the Central Group of Forces asked CTK to offer their apologies to Czechoslovak citizens for the occurrence. The Central Group of Forces command is taking measures to compensate for any damage caused.

Timing of Incident 'Annoying'

PM1202151590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "Echo of an Explosion"]

[Text] Prague—A powerful explosion in the vicinity of one of the military garrisons of the Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia has fortunately claimed no lives nor, as thorough investigations have shown, did it cause any pollution of the environment.

Some 500 shells exploded all at once and the shock waves spread over eight to 10 kilometers. Windows in many houses were shattered. The investigation continues, but it has already been established that the cause of the incident was simple technical ignorance.

It is most annoying that this has happened right now when the situation around the question of the stay of our troops in the CSSR is already rather strained. Urgent talks between Czechoslovak authorities and experts and representatives of the Central Group of Forces have been held. Agreement has been reached that in the future munitions to be destroyed will be taken to Soviet territory or will be destroyed locally in much smaller quantities. The Soviet side has issued a public apology and has embarked on eliminating the consequences and compensating for the damage.

West Europe

Falin, Delegation Depart for Strasbourg

LD1202092590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0755 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb (TASS)—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet headed by Valentin Falin, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs and head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Strasbourg today. On the invitation of the European Parliament and the North Atlantic Council, the delegation will visit the headquarters of these organizations, where they will hold meetings and discussions.

Belgium's Defense Minister Continues Visit

Welcomed by Yazov, Moiseyev

PM0902094790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Single Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at the USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] Guy Coeme, minister of national defense for the Kingdom of Belgium, arrived 7 February on an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

The guest and his entourage were met at the airport by Army Gen. D.T. Yazov; Army General M.A. Moiseyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; USSR Deputy Defense Ministers Army General I.M. Tretyak, Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, and Army General M.I. Sorokin; and other generals and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Belgian Ambassador to the USSR L. Putman was among the welcoming party.

The state flags of the Kingdom of Belgium and the Soviet Union flew at the airport, a guard of honor was drawn up on the airfield, and the two countries' national anthems were played.

A meeting between Army Gen. D.T. Yazov and Belgium's Minister of National Defense G. Coeme was held the same day at the USSR Defense Ministry. During the conversation they discussed a series of questions of mutual interest.

Taking part in the conversation were: on the Soviet side—Army Gen. M.A. Moiseyev, Army Gen. I.M. Tretyak, Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, Army Gen. M.I. Sorokin, and other officials; on the Belgian side—Belgian Ambassador to the USSR L. Putman and Lieutenant General Zh. Sharlye [name as transliterated], chief of the Belgian Armed Forces General Staff.

The Belgian guests laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall.

Army Gen. D.T. Yazov gave a dinner in honor of G. Coeme.

Tours Tank Division

LD0902001690 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 8 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS—Visiting Belgian Defence Minister Guy Coeme today visited an Air Force garrison in Kubinka, Moscow region, to acquaint himself with Soviet combat planes and helicopters and to watch model flights.

Coeme visited the Guards' Kantemirovskaya Tank Division, named after Yuriy Andropov, to acquaint himself with the training and lifestyle of soldiers.

Accompanied to Bolshoi Theater

PM1202160790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Visit Continued"]

[Excerpts] On 8 February G. Coeme, Belgian defense minister, who was in the USSR on an official visit, spoke to USSR people's deputies who are members of the USSR Supreme Soviet defense and state security and international affairs committee. [passage omitted]

In the evening, the Belgian visitor went to a performance at the USSR State Academy Bolshoi Theater. He was accompanied by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and first deputy minister of defense.

Gives Address on 'New Europe'

LD0902002290 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 8 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS—Fear must be overcome if Europe is to progress, said Belgian Defence Minister Guy Coeme, addressing today two Soviet parliamentary committees, for international affairs and for defence and state security.

The minister said he was motivated in visiting the Soviet Union by the hope of achieving greater cohesion and harmony in Europe. He said that political boldness and military wisdom, rich imagination and a great deal of sincerity are needed to realise this hope. A dialogue should be conducted and views on these matters should be aired.

The defence minister said that the process of determining the areas of joint action, of common interests in politics, economy, culture and human relations will determine the look of tomorrow's Europe. The military alliances should be adapted to the new Europe. Guy Coeme said that arms reduction is only part of the answer to this question.

Peace and stability in new Europe are to be ensured by a combination of a number of guarantees, not by a balance of fear, the minister said.

First, a guarantee against external threat will be provided by the alliance of forces of the parties.

Second, there will be a guarantee of internal stability by the introduction of a number of decrees and restrictions determining the numerical strength, character, structure, deployment and tasks of the armed forces of each country so that none of them could threaten others.

Regarding the course of the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe, Guy Coeme said that, although not all the obstacles have been overcome at the negotiations, there is reason to hope that they can be surmounted, as the sides obviously wish to achieve agreement within a short period of time.

The minister said that the establishment of parity in armaments, now being discussed, will alleviate fears in Western Europe caused by military danger and will help revise the role assigned to nuclear weapons in Europe.

There is every reason to hope that the sides will go even further, Coeme said. There are proposals that at the second stage NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries should discuss the possibility of cutting armaments to 50 per cent of the present NATO potential.

The tasks connected with the verification of the implementation of the treaty on conventional armaments, the implementation of the open skies plan, confidence and security-building measures and the possible creation of a European military risk reduction centre might require the pooling of manpower, technological and financial resources and the creation of the mechanism for permanent coordination.

Received by Primakov, Belousov

PM1202160190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversations Held"]

[Text] On 9 February a conversation was held between Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and candidate member of the CPSU Cental Committee Politburo, and Guy Coeme, Belgian minister of national defense, who is paying an official visit to our country.

The visitor was briefed on the problems of interethnic relations in the USSR and the ways of resolving conflicts so motivated. He was told in detail about the state of affairs in the Transcaucasus and the causes and consequences of the worsening situation surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh.

Guy Coeme was informed on the increased role and functions of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the life of our society and its place in the political structure of the Soviet state.

On the same day Guy Coeme visited Zvezdnyy Gorodok, where he learned about the Yu.A. Gagarin Cosmonaut Training Center.

Also on the same day Guy Coeme was received by I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Questions of interest to our countries were examined during the conversation, which was held in a spirit of mutual understanding.

Luc Putman, Belgian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversations.

Confers With Karpov 10 Feb

LD1002163590 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—A meeting between Guy Coeme, Belgian minister of national defense, who is currently in the Soviet Union on an official visit, and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov took place in the USSR Foreign Ministry today.

Matters concerning the situation in Europe were touched upon during the meeting, and the importance of relaxation of tension in the military and political fields on the continent and of achieving progress at the Vienna talks on conventional arms and confidence-building measures as soon as possible was pointed out.

The two sides declared for further development of the Soviet-Belgian political dialogue that can become an important element of creating a new atmosphere of mutual trust on the European continent.

Questioned at News Conference

I D1002164290 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—Belgian Defence Minister Guy Coeme held a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press centre today.

The Belgian minister is on an official visit in the Soviet Union at the invitation of Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov.

Guy Coeme said his talks with Army General Dmitriy Yazov, attended by Soviet and Belgian chiefs of staff, marked a new stage in the development of bilateral contacts in the military field.

Despite the divergence of views on some issues, the Belgian minister continued, "The talks were marked by an atmosphere of sincerity and trust."

Military contacts are crucial for improving the situation in Europe, strengthening trust and understanding between states involved in the European process. Military links will also help the policy of security and cooperation in Europe to be increasingly reflected in military doctrines and strategy, the structures of the armed forces of European countries. The talks focused on contacts between the armed forces of the Soviet Union and Belgium in the near future.

The Belgian defence minister replied to questions by journalists.

Discusses German Unification

LD1002103290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Interview with Belgian Defense Minister Guy Coeme by Irina Mishina in Moscow; date not given—recorded, Coeme in French fading into superimposed report by Mishina in Russian]

[Text] [Mishina] Although Guy Coeme came to our country at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Defense, his agenda includes not only meetings with military officials and diplomats, but also a visit to the Soviet parliament. The Belgian minister spoke a few days ago in the Supreme Soviet and this speech aroused a large amount of interest. I also heard his speech to

Soviet parliamentarians, and I would like to say that he touched on a whole series of issues that are currently worrying all inhabitants of the European continent. First and foremost is the problem of the unification of the two German states. This is the point of view the Belgian minister expressed on this problem:

[Coeme] I cannot say that there is a single attitude toward this issue in Europe, Guy Coeme says. We understand and share the fears of the Soviet Union, which took upon itself the main blow during World War II. Belgium was also a victim of fascism. For this reason we should do everything to prevent the reunification process from being anarchic. We must not allow the ultra-right to come to power in Germany nor the mistakes of the past to be repeated. Many people are now asking what will occur as a result of reunification. I do not think that Germany will be neutral, Guy Coeme says. The fact is that the FRG is, by tradition, a member of the North Atlantic bloc and the GDR is part of the Warsaw Pact. It is another matter that the Warsaw Pact—many people are currently speaking about this—is turning more and more from a military and political alliance into a political alliance. Demilitarization also is extending into the NATO bloc, and I think in the future these two blocs will move along the road of searching for mutual compromises and, perhaps, also along the road of cooperation. Why not? In the final analysis they also should adapt to the new conditions now taking shape in Europe.

Speaking about the process of the reunification of the two German states, the Belgian minister stressed especially that this process cannot bypass international agreements on Germany's postwar borders, including the border along the Oder-Neisse. Guy Coeme expressed this thought: Not only the German people but all Europeans bear responsibility for the future of Germany. After all, Europe is comprised of different states and each of them has freedom of choice. But one another's interests also must be taken into consideration. Our differences, if they occur, are surmountable; the talks on conventional arms in Vienna have proved this.

Sovereignty, self determination, independence, and balance of interests—this is how, in brief, Guy Coeme, the Belgian minister of foreign affairs [as heard] defined the future European continent. In my opinion, it is hard not to agree with this thought.

Opposes German Neutrality

LD1002200290 Brussels Domestic Service in French 1600 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Belgian Defense Minister Guy Coeme is in Moscow at this moment. The Germans must understand, Guy Coeme underlined at a press conference in Moscow this afternoon, that the Soviets must have military guarantees so that everyone may not be able to become a threat to others. But the Belgian minister of defense quickly added that the neutrality of Germany is not possible and, furthermore, it would be a mistake and even a threat, because an economically powerful state cannot not remain neutral without being like a bubble that risks to explode in the middle of a continent.

Meets Leningrad Commander

LD1102010590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1650 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Leningrad, 10 February (TASS)—The three-day visit here by Guy Coeme, Belgian minister of national defense, was the final item on the agenda of his official visit to the USSR at the invitation of Army General Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

The Belgian minister visited Colonel General Viktor Yermakov, troop commander of the Leningrad Military District. During the conversation it was noted that the arrival of the head of Belgium's Defense Department in the USSR and conversations with his Soviet counterparts will serve to further strengthen mutual understanding between states on the European Continent with different social systems. Col. Gen. Viktor Yermakov gave a dinner in honor of the eminent guest. During the dinner there was an exchange of speeches, which pointed to the need to strengthen confidence-building measures and to expand cooperation between the armed forces of the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact member states.

Guy Coeme will visit the Naval Academy, which is the main teaching establishment for training command staff for the Soviet Navy and will familiarize himself with the Baltic Shipyard.

TASS Reports on Moiseyev's Visit to Finland

Trip Previewed; Goals Outlined

LD1002235490 Moscow TASS in English 1250 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 10 TASS—"The existing relations of goodneighbourliness and mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and Finland are a vivid example of the exercise of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems," General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet Armed Forces' General Staff, told TASS in an interview connected with his three-day official visit to Finland, beginning today.

General Moiseyev believes that the positive processes gathering momentum in the world and particularly in Europe are forcing both politicians and military officers to reassess political priorities and the means to attain them.

He recalled that the Soviet military doctrine is aimed primarily at preventing war and is opening up a realistic prospect to sharply lower the level of military confrontation between the Warsaw Treaty and North Atlantic Treaty Organisations.

"The Soviet Union's moves to strengthen security in the north of Europe are a patent reaffirmation of the implementation of the Soviet doctrine," Moiseyev said.

"Regular meetings between representatives of the Armed Forces of our two countries have established a good tradition. Such meetings enrich the two sides with useful experience, both professional and worldly."

"By cooperating in the military field, we the military make our contribution to the development of friendly, goodneighbourly relations between our two countries and to the strengthening of peace," General Moiseyev said.

Moiseyev Arrives in Helsinki

LD1202104190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1010 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Helsinki, 12 Feb (TASS)—Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, arrived in Finland on Monday on an official visit.

He was met at Helsinki's Vantaa Airport by General J. Valtanen, commander in chief of the Finnish Defense Forces, and by generals and officers of the armed forces of the country, and other officials.

Then there was a solemn ceremony of welcome for the Soviet guest in the Finnish Defense Ministry.

Koivisto Confers With Moiseyev

LD1302020190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Helsinki, 12 Feb (TASS)—Army General M.A. Moiseyev has been received by M. Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, supreme commander in chief of the Armed Forces. During the conversation, which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, some issues of mutual interest were touched upon.

The Soviet military commander also visited General J.Valtanen, chief of General Headquarters of Finland's Armed Forces, and Minister of Defense O. Norrback.

In the afternoon Army Gen. Moiseyev visited the cemetery at Hietaniemi and laid wreaths on the graves of two Finnish presidents, J. K. Paasikivi and U.K. Kekkonen.

General Valtanen, chief of General Headquarters of Finland's Armed Forces, gave a dinner in honor of the USSR Armed Forces' chief of General Staff.

Yakovlev on Soviet Troops in 'Reunified Germany'

LD1202124990 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] The Soviet troops will not leave a reunified Germany if the military units of the Western countries remain there. That has been stated in an interview for a Radio Moscow correspondent by Aleksandr Yakovlev, a member of the Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party. He was commenting on the prospects of the reunification of the two German states and the stand of the Soviet Union on the issue.

Aleksandr Yakovlev believes that the question of the withdrawal of troops will require a careful study. It will without any doubt become a subject of thorough and lengthy talks. He noted that the solution of the problem affects not only the two German states but also the interests of many other powers and therefore it should be discussed on both a bilateral and multilateral basis.

Medvedev Delegation Touring Great Britain

PRAVDA on Wales Visit

PM1202163990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Parliamentary Delegation Visit"]

[Text] Cardiff, 10 Feb—The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by USSR People's Deputy V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, which is visiting Britain, has been to Wales.

In Newport the delegation visited the British Steel company's steelworks. It is one of the biggest and most advanced metallurgical enterprises in Britain. The main production processes are automated and computerized.

After an inspection of the enterprise there was a detailed conversation with the plant leadership and trade union leaders. The visitors were particularly interested in the history of the enterprise, which was making a loss at the end of the seventies.

The first question was posed by USSR People's Deputy N.V. Molotkov, a worker at the Ryazan Engineering Plant. He wanted to know what kind of relationship there was between the administration and the workers. One of the trade union leaders replied that there was no antagonism between the enterprise leadership and the trade union members. According to him, they feel that they are members of the same team, committed to success.

USSR People's Deputy Professor N.P. Shmelev asked what proportion of the workers' incomes was made up of dividends on shares in the enterprise, which was denationalized in 1988. The administration and trade union representatives said that the proportion was small (less than 1 percent), stressing that the main stimulus to good work was the range of material and moral incentives, in particular pride in the enterprise and a substantial incentive for high-quality, productive work in the form of bonuses which can amount to 30 percent of basic pay. Enterprise employees have less than 2 percent of the total value of the share issue.

When asked by R.A. Ubaydullayeva, deputy chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions, how labor conflicts were settled at the plant, the British interlocutors remarked that as a rule they were settled at the negotiating table. It was noted that there had not been a single strike at the plant since 1980, when the process of the enterprise's rebirth began.

"What advice would you give to Soviet workers?" K.D. Lubenchenko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, asked. "If you can establish the same relationship between workers and management as we have, things will go well," plant trade union committee Chairman P. Makkim replied. "I would advise you not to exaggerate the significance of privatization of enterprises. The main thing, as we have said before, is harmony of interests and partnership between workers and the plant management."

The delegation went to the administrative center of Wales, the city of Cardiff. Lord Mayor of Cardiff B. Jones organized a reception in its honor. She called the Soviet visit further evidence of the improvement of bilateral relations between the USSR and Britain and expressed the hope that the changes taking place in the USSR will enrich Soviet-British relations.

The Soviet parliamentarians met with the authors of a plan for the total transformation of the decaying port area of Cardiff. The main aim of this plan, one of the biggest of its kind in Europe, is to demonstrate the possibility of rationally combining industrial development with the creation of the most favorable conditions possible for people's lives and recreation. It was pointed out to the visitors that the authors of the plan envisage creating jobs for thousands of people in the area who are currently out of work. The state will contribute approximately 25 percent to the plan, which is currently under discussion.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation had a meeting with members of South Glamorgan County Concil.

USSR Supreme Soviet delegation head V.A. Medvedev had a meeting with Secretary of State for Wales P. Walker. A luncheon was given in the Soviet visitors' honor. British Ambassador to the USSR R. Braithwaite and USSR Ambassadfor to Britain L.M. Zamyatin were present at the meeting.

During the meeting there was a discussion of questions concerning the present state of Soviet-British relations and the potential for expanding ties between the two countries in various spheres.

Meanwhile, delegation members, USSR People's Deputies N.B. Bikkenin, V.I. Goldanskiy, K.D. Lubenchenko, N.V. Molotkov, R.A. Ubaydullayeva, and N.P. Shmelev split into three groups and went to different Welsh constituencies. They met with the local members of Parliament, learned about their work with voters, and exchanged opinions on the place and role of parliamentarians in solving people's socioeconomic problems. There were also meetings and conversations with British voters, representatives of local authorities, journalists, and the public.

Lloyds, Stock Exchange Toured

LD1302000290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Feb 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Now a report from London on the stay in Great Britain of a USSR Supreme Soviet,delegation headed by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev.

[D. Biryukov] On 11 February Comrade Medvedev met Nina Temple, secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Present were members of the party leadership. During the meeting, the British Communists were told about the CPSU Central Committee Plenum that has taken place and about the CPSU platform for the forthcoming congress. The meeting participants exchanged views on certain topical questions of the international situation. In particular, the situation in central Europe was touched upon. [video shows Medvedev, Temple, several other men, chatting seated inside an office]

Today began with a visit to the headquarters of Three-I, a major private company. The firm was founded back in 1945 and now has cash holdings of more than 2 billion pounds. From this money, for example, loans are given to the company's clients who wish to expand production. Last year there were about 4,000 such clients. Relying on the financing of Three-I, last year alone 108 groups of the company's senior personnel bought out the companies in which they work. [video shows exteriors of Three-I buildings; interior, shots of Medvedev and delegation inside].

During the talks, to which journalists were not admitted, possibilities were discussed for establishing contacts. The next point on the program was the London Stock Exchange. [passage omitted] In a conversation with leaders of the Stock Exchange, it emerged that it is not all that complicated to find ways to cooperate in the economic sphere. The main thing is that there should be a willingness on both sides. In the second half of the day, the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation visited the Lloyds company and the Bank of England.

The program for the stay of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation is coming to an end, and we asked Michael Marshall, a member of the House of Commons, to appraise the results of meetings between Soviet and British parliamentarians. [video shows Marshall and Biryukov in conversation]

[Begin Marshall recording in English with superimposed Russian translation] I think that the main things in our conversations were sincerity, the openness of both sides, and mutual understanding. The guests probably felt our deep interest in the changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union. Members of the Inter-Parliamentary

Union concluded that it is essential to overcome the stereotypes of the past, to distance ourselves from that which divided us, and to persistently look for all possibilities for joint efforts in those areas that are mutually-advantageous and are of bilateral interest. We frankly informed our Soviet colleagues and tried, together with them, to determine possibilities for further expanding cooperation in political, cultural, and industrial spheres. We think that this can promote the implementation of that gigantic experiment that your country is implementing. [end recording]

Latin America & Caribbean

Nishanov Receives Brazilian Parliamentarians

LD0802104490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1104 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Feb (TASS)—A delegation of the National Congress of the Federative Republic of Brazil, led by Antonio Paes de Andrade, chairman of the Chamber of Deputies of the National Congress, is paying an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The delegation today visited the USSR Supreme Soviet. Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and a group of USSR people's deputies described to them the progress of the perestroyka that is being implemented in the Soviet Union and the work of the new Soviet parliament. It was stressed that the fundamental social reforms in Soviet society are geared to developing in full the creative, humanist potential of socialism, and the elimination of dogmatic attitudes when tackling topical sociopolitical problems. The chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities informed the Brazilian parliamentarians about the fundamental issues being discussed at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the work of the chambers, commissions and committees of the supreme body of state power in the country, preparations for its forthcoming session, and the way in which the interests of working people are taken into consideration when new draft laws are formulated.

The head of the Brazilian delegation expressed a hope for the successful implementation of the Soviet leadership's policy, and spoke in favor of the comprehensive development of bilateral contacts, including those at the parliamentary level.

Meeting of South American Communist Parties

PM0602154190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 90 Second Edition p 7

[PRAVDA correspondent A. Zagorskiy and TASS correspondent M. Stepanov dispatch: "From Principled Positions. Results of Meeting of South American Communist Parties' Representatives"]

[Text] Quito, 5 Feb—The fourth meeting of representatives of South American communist parties has ended its work here. Following a lively and open debate, the forum participants adopted a communique expressing the communist parties' readiness to continue the struggle for working people's interests in alliance with all forces advocating peace, democracy, and social progress.

The delegates resolutely advocated the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Panamanian territory and declared the need to observe the Panama Canal treaties. It was noted at the same time that Washington's intervention in Panama poses a threat to socialist Cuba, revolutionary Nicaragua, and the peoples of El Salvador and Guatemala.

The emissaries of South American communist parties positively appraised perestroyka's contribution to the development of detente and disarmament, which create conditions for establishing international cooperation in the interests of all mankind. They noted, moreover, that the United States continues to pursue an aggressive policy toward developing states.

Having analyzed the events occurring in East European countries, the communist parties' representatives expressed satisfaction with transformations in the social and economic spheres and in the system of political institutions which promote the strengthening of socialism and democracy. At the same time, concern was expressed at the activity of forces trying to restore the exploitation of man by man in East European states.

The communique contains the conclusion that the processes of renewal do not signify the death of socialism, which still remains the hope of mankind.

The forum expressed solidarity with the Cuban people, who, as the resolution approved by the meeting participants says, are confidently marching toward the building of socialism while using methods suited to local conditions.

The delegates rejected the thesis that Central America is an arena of East-West confrontation, noting that a national liberation struggle for independence, sovereignty, and self-determination is being waged by the peoples in this region.

The forum participants welcomed the victory of democratic forces in Chile while pointing out that reaction has still not been finally defeated. They supported the position of "constructive independence" taken by the Chilean Communist Party toward P. Aylwin's future government and spoke out in favor of the immediate release of political prisoners.

Supreme Soviet Session

3d Session Coverage of Supreme Soviet Detailed

LD1202065690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] As we have already reported to you the work of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet begins 14 February in Moscow. On that day at 0955 [0655 GMT] Central Television on the first and second channels, All-Union radio on the first channel, and our Mayak will carry the live relay of the session's opening.

Concerning the daily work of the session, on Central Television on the second channel at 1900 [1600 GMT] and on Mayak radio from 1800 [1500 GMT] you can follow the proceedings of the Soviet parliament session.

Of course, reports from the session, from the sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet commissions and committees, interviews, and conversations will also be included in other radio and television programs.

Supreme Soviet Commissions, Committees To Meet

LD1302050790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Text] Today, the Supreme Soviet committees and commissions will discuss the material and technical balance of the plan for this year, the draft legislations on taxation, the status of the people's deputies, and the general foundations of local self-government and self-management. Deputies' commissions for examing the privileges enjoyed by certain categories of citizens will meet today.

Commissions Lay Groundwork

LD1202061590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] The registration of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet coming for the Third session begins today. I will remind you that that session will open in two days, that is, on 14 February. The deputies have to examine laws on land, property, and local self-government. It is natural that on the eve of the session the committees of our parliament are working intensively, as are the chamber commissions. Today, in particular, the commission of the Soviet of the Union on Issues of Development of Industry, Energy, Equipment and Technology will continue discussion of the draft law on socialist enterprise.

Deputies who are in the Commission on Consumer Goods and Trade (Commission on Consumer Goods, Trade, Municipal and Other Services) will today listen to the minister of trade. As you realize, we have more than enough problems in this area. The session of the Committee on Construction and Architecture will discuss new investment policy and draft bills on investment.

'Text' of Supreme Soviet Meeting 12 Feb

LD1202193590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1754 GMT 12 Feb 90

["Full text" on the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium meeting held in the Kremlin on 12 February 1990; quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb (TASS)—"A sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, under the chairmanship of M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, took place in the Kremlin on 12 February.

Taking into account the discussions under way in society on the issues of deepening political reform, the place and role of the party, soviets, and public organizations within this process, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium came to the conclusion that it is necesary to introduce a number of changes and addenda to the USSR Constitution with regard to the questions of political system, ownership, and the strengthening of the Soviet state. The Supreme Soviet Presidium unanimously expressed itself in favor of establishing a democratic presidential power in our country. An extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies is to be convened in the nearest future to examine these questions.

Proposals on this are to be made to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The session examined matters connected with the preparations for, and the holding of the Third Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, opening on 14 February this year.

Having examined a report by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet, and taking account of the particular topicality of renewing legislation in the sphere of the nationalities policy, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium passed on for examination by the committees of the Supreme Soviet and permanent commissions of the chambers, a number of draft laws—on the demarcation of powers between the USSR and the union republics, on the procedure for dealing with matters connected with a union republic seceding from the USSR in accordance with Article 72 of the USSR Constitution, on increasing responsibility for encroachments upon the national equality of citizens and for forcible violation of the unity of USSR territory.

According to the reports of V.S. Pavlov, USSR minister of finance, and V.V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs [MVD], the Presidium adopted a decision on the transfer of draft laws submitted by the USSR Government for examination by the Supreme Soviet on the rights of state tax inspectorates, on the legal status of the state of emergency, and on the obligations and rights of the internal troops of the USSR MVD in maintaining public order. It is envisaged that the relevant committees and commissions will present their conclusions on the said draft laws.

In accordance with a decision of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the session will elect a USSR Supreme Soviet committee on matters relating to the fight against crime, and also a commission on the working procedure of the supreme organs of state power of the USSR, and a commission on matters relating to deputies ethics. Information was provided on this by Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the Supreme Soviet. The Presidium has elaborated proposals on the composition of these organs.

According to a report by A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the the USSR Supreme Soviet, proposals on the organization of the work of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet have been discussed, and in the main approved.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium then examined the issue of the resolutions of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet "On the historical and legal evaluation of the events which took place in Estonia in 1940," and of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet "On the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 and the elimination of their consequences for Lithuania," which place in doubt and deem invalid the acts of 1940 on the entry of these republics into the USSR. In view of the importance of the matter in question, a decision has been made to recommend it for examination at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sitting also examined certain other matters of state life."

Supreme Soviet Committees Debate Land Law

LD0902234190 Moscow TASS in English 2121 GMT 9 Feb 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—Should private property on land be allowed in the USSR? This question is keenly discussed both in parliament and in Soviet society. It remained one of the most heatedly debated topics at today's meeting of the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet on legislation and on agrarian issues. They discussed the draft of the fundamental principles of the legislation of the USSR and the union republics on land.

The draft was submitted to the committees after its further study following nationwide discussion.

Just like a bill on property, it was adopted in first reading at the autumn session of parliament and then put to nationwide debate.

The Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR held in December 1989 vested the Supreme Soviet with the right to enforce the draft and make respective changes in the country's Constitution at the spring session opening on February 14.

It is common knowledge that the draft envisages the category of land possession inherited for life, which actually means property without the right to purchase or sale it, present or mortgage. [sentence as received]

In addition, the draft notes that the legislation of union and autonomous republics can define the conditions and terms, upon the expiration of which, land plots in possession of citizens of the USSR become their property.

Many of the Soviet people who spoke during the nationwide debate favoured the introduction of private property without any restrictions. But there were as many letters expressing diametrically oppossite views.

"The bill on land is a sizeable step forward. It opens scope for the development of new forms of economic activity," Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya, people's deputy of the USSR, told TASS. "Considering that a large part of the population has a negative attitude to private property, the category of the possession inherited for life is optimum today.

"In granting to the republics the right to define conditions for the transfer of land into private property, the bill takes into account the vast differences among the country's regions in the attitude of their population to private property," Zaslavskaya said.

To confirm her words, Zaslavskaya alluded to the findings of the latest sociological poll conducted by the opinion poll survey centre headed by her. They showed that 80 per cent of those polled in Latvia favoured private property while in many other regions of the country the picture was just the opposite.

Commission Drafts Property Bill

LD0802184490 Moscow TASS in English 1817 GMT 8 Feb 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent]

[Text] Moscow February 8 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet's committees and commissions are finalising the drafting of the property bill, the main document in the current stage of the Soviet economic reform. It is expected to be passed at the Parliament's Third session, planned to open on February 14.

The preliminary results of its nationwide discussion were summed up at today's joint meeting of the parliamentary committees on legislation and economic reform.

Following a heated discussion the first reading of the property bill was approved at the Soviet parliament's Second session last autumn. The deputies then decided to submit for a nationwide discussion not only that document but also alternative bills drafted in the Soviet Baltic republics and the Parliamentary Committee on Ecology.

The new wording of the bill, submitted to the deputies today, retains all the main provisions, approved by the Parliament's autumn session. It proposes various forms of property and the use of hired labour in the USSR.

The document also has new provisions, which came as a result of a thorough study of thousands of proposals from Soviet people. One of its main articles reads that land and natural resources are the property of the union republics and autonomous regions which put land plots in the authority of the USSR to be used for All-Union purposes. Exactly to whom the land belongs caused the most heated discussions at the Parliament's second session.

At today's meeting it was noted that the analysis of letters and public opinion polls, held during the bill's discussion, illustrates majority support for the property bill.

Aproximately 56 per cent agreed with the idea of private property in its various forms.

But that was not convincing for many people's deputies, who expressed discontent with the bill's articles today, which led to a new heated discussion.

A conference commission was formed to make a final decision on all controversial issues.

"The difficulties in passing the bill are something normal," Yuriy Kalmykov, acting chairman of the Committee on Legislation, told TASS. "Many of its provisions are really revolutionary, since they break politico-economical postulates our society was based on. I hope that we shall be able to reach consent on all provisions and make the bill ready for discussion at the beginning of the USSR Supreme Soviet's spring session.

Supreme Soviet Drafts Bill on Religious Freedom

LD0902205990 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 9 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

A law on freedom of conscience in the Soviet Union will become a new step towards the implementation of the provisions of the final document of the Vienna meeting on human rights. The bill, which will soon come up for discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet, was referred today to the Parliamentary Committee on Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Requests.

Mikhail Ivolgin, first deputy chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told deputies that the single law for the whole country has the purpose of ensuring the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the constitution and to replace various legal acts operating in union republics.

Ivolgin said that the law applies not only to religious people of various faiths, (their numbers in the Soviet Union is estimated at 60-70 million) but also at all Soviet citizens.

The bill submitted to deputies today is based on the principle of the separation of the church from the state and of the school from the church. Freedom of conscience is interpreted in the bill as the right of every citizen to freely choose religious creeds or atheist convictions, to worship privately or together with other citizens according to any religions or to have no religion.

Freedom to worship privately or publicly or to express religious or atheist views is restricted only by law within limits necessary for the protection of citizens' health and morality and public order.

Ivolgin believes the fundamentally new feature of the bill is the provision about granting legal rights to religious organisations, which entails all the rights of property.

The document also determines the procedure for engaging in missionary or charitable activities of these organisations and their participation in a public dialogue, also through news organisations.

The bill envisages the possibility of replacing one civic duty with another for religious reasons. This might be applied also to the military service.

But there is no unanimity on this provision even among the authors of the bill, and it should be studied further, Ivolgin said.

After a brief debate, the Committee on Glasnost and Citizens Rights and Requests decided that the bill be formulated and perfected by a working group formed of people's deputies.

Supreme Soviet Session To Focus on Economy

LD0702144190 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 7 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Third Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, scheduled for February 14, seems likely to focus on the present state and prospects of the Soviet federation and its economic problems. The parliamentary committees and commissions are now discussing bills on ownership and land, as well as on general principles of economic and social management in Union and autonomous republics.

The parliamentary economic reform committee, for instance, noted today that this bill is primarily a political document, which will largely determine the Soviet Union's future.

The difficult and frequently contradictory nature of present-day relations between Soviet republics and the centre has led to parliament turning down the document twice during last year's autumn session.

Deputies believed it did not give sufficient attention to the interests of republics and autonomous units, and perpetuated central dictate.

In the new version, the union's rights were substantially scaled down. Nevertheless, the centre is still empowered to fix taxes and dues, control prices and tariffs on principal types of goods, administer transport facilities, power supplies and communication services, carry out a unified foreign economic policy and several other basic functions.

Noting that the new version is more progressive than previous ones, the deputies were rather critical about some of its aspects. They pointed out today that the document's third version perpetuated the domination of central economic bodies in many ways. A radical proposal was made not to approve the bill until a new constitution of the country is adopted and a new Union treaty is signed.

Academician Mikhail Bronshteyn of Estonia disagreed. He stressed that the bill was intended to lay the economic foundation of a new federation and, therefore, to help draft a new constitution.

"However," he said, "the proposed bill still needs serious improvements, because many of its provisions are rather vague and can be broadly interpreted."

The deputies backed the working group's proposal to change the name of the document and to call it "The Draft Law on the Principles of Economic Relations Between the USSR and the Union and Autonomous Republics".

Foreign Economic Relations Bill Submitted

LD0702165790 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 7 TASS—By TASS economic analyst Yuriy Stepanov:

The State Foreign Economic Commission under the USSR Council of Ministers had submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet several bills intended to bring Soviet foreign economic legislation into line with the requirements of international law. Some other bills are still in the making.

It is too early to say what they will be like after parliamentary deliberations. The deputies are now thoroughly examining the government's proposals.

The commission attaches particular importance to the bill on joint-stock enterprises. It will give Soviet industry, various business associations and societies a solid legal instrument—a joint-stock company. Joint-stock enterprises, which now have the status of joint ventures, will be turned into joint-stock societies.

An anti-monopoly bill is also being drawn up. It will conform to the norms of international law. The bill is based on the West European concept of protecting consumer rights, and not on the American, which protects competition.

Amendments have been made to the bill on ownership, which will be submitted for a second reading by parliament. They advocate the concept of real estate, which could be used as a deposit in investment and crediting operations. This amendment will provide foreign partners with material guarantees of their investments in the USSR.

The other bills, now being drafted by foreign economic agencies, include a bill on joint enterprises (now their operations are governed by a government decision). The question is now being raised of elaborating a more general law on foreign investments, covering all their forms and types. Such a broader approach to the foreign economic legislation will be in keeping with world practice.

CPSU Central Committee Plenum

PRAVDA Publishes 7 February Plenum Speeches

Saykin on Party's 'Acute' Problems

PM1202134590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[Debate speech by V.T. Saykin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies Executive Committee, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Comrades! Our plenum is meeting in an exceptional situation and, I believe, on exceptionally important questions. I regard as such both the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th Party Congress and the discussion of questions connected with the decisions of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. For all the outward dissimilarity between these two questions, there is an inward interconnection stemming from the fact that the party and the country are experiencing an extremely grave crisis of the political and economic system. And it must be bluntly and frankly said today that the party, as our society's leading force, finds itself face to face with many extremely acute problems for which it must not only answer to the people but also find a way out. A call for this was also voiced at the demonstration by almost 200,000 people held in the center of Moscow.

Unfortunately, the draft platform does not contain the answers to many burning questions that communists and the entire Soviet people are awaiting. It contains no proper analysis of the road of perestroyka that has been traveled and all too few constructive proposals for the upcoming—essentially extraordinary—party congress.

Difficult though it may have been, the errors of the perestroyka period and their authors ought to have been named and the situation today ought to have been critically analyzed. We ought also to have found within ourselves the courage to say that the Central Committee, in initiating perestroyka and mobilizing the people for it, did not fully elaborate interconnected solutions of political and economic problems but acted often spontaneously, on the principle of merely "plunging into the fray." But politics is above all the art of foreseeing, the art of forecasting both immediate and distant political and economic consequences. And now we are reaping the fruits of hasty decisions.

When it comes to the economy, our errors lie in the imperfection of the laws and decisions adopted lately. In the past, certain leaders refused to listen to opinions from local level about distortions in the draft laws on the enterprise and the cooperative movement—and today, for all the importance of these laws to perestroyka and the economy, now one flaw is coming to light, now another.

We expedited wholesale trade and the introduction of contractual prices, but altogether failed to take into account what we have for this.

Today, as a result of these miscalculations and of the incompetence and irresponsibility of the drafters of the laws, there is imbalance in the material and technical supply of the national economy, an intolerably great exodus of personnel to the cooperatives, idle time at plants and factories, worsening shortages in the consumer market, and rampant price hikes and inflation. So far as fruit and vegetable produce alone is concerned, these shortages cost Moscow R600 million. Social tension is increasing among the population.

If we add to this the concept of democracy as total license which is widespread in society, the raging crime, the stratification of society, and the manipulation by dishonest people of the proclaimed thesis that "Everything not prohibited by the law is permitted," we will obtain in general outline the situation that we ourselves have brought about by thoughtless actions during the perestroyka period. And it is above all the working class that is the loser in all this.

I know that among economists there are theorists who reassure people that, "scientifically speaking," this is bound to happen and that at first the situation will be bad, but then it will be good. The people can certainly see that it is bad, but I am not sure that it will be good and I don't want to wait any longer.

Clearly, there is a need to elaborate a model of economic reform ensuring that all enterprises, cooperatives, and scientific institutions enjoy economically equal starting conditions. But in our country today some eke out a pitiful existence, while others are rolling in plenty.

Professor Fedorov spoke yesterday and lectured us all on how we ought to live and work. But who in the Russian Federation Council of Ministers helped to create starting conditions for him which right from the outset placed his institute in an exceptional situation compared to other similar medical institutions?

Let us be honest and say bluntly that the prosperity of the "Eye Microsurgery" Intersectorial Scientific and Technical Complex is not only the result of the organizational abilities of the collective's leaders. The point here is something completely different. Whereas according to the normatives in 1988, R33 million, or an average of R258 per patient, was allocated in 1988 for running Comrade Fedorov's complex, the cost per patient undergoing an operation in a city clinical hospital with the same specialism was adopted only on the basis of a calculation of R116.

These medical institutions have approximately the same indicators this year, too. According to USSR Health Minister Chazov, if the whole of health care were to be switched to Comrade Fedorov's experiment, this would require no less than R20 billion. So the question arises: Whom are we fooling?

Enterprises with extremely hard working conditions, metalworkers, and steel makers are paying taxes to the state so Comrade Fedorov and his collective can receive wages three times higher than in other medical institutions. This is lawlessness! Economic lawlessness!

A rather similar situation with regard to labor remuneration is now prevailing in cooperatives, scientific and technical centers, and young people's creative centers. The Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] has also become extremely keen on cooperative activity.

We have streamlined the ministries and lost some of the management of industry, but on the other hand we have created all kinds of associations, joint ventures, and sundry unions with considerably larger staffs and higher wages than existed in the ministries. All this is arousing a storm of indignation among honest working people, although they know by no means the whole truth about the stratification that is taking place in society and about the growing social injustice. They do not know it because they are increasingly fed stories of the "intrigues of apparatchiks" as the bitterest enemies of the people, and attempts are made not to unduly publicize the emergence of a new Soviet elite.

In my view, the economic situation can be changed, social tension alleviated, and trust in perestroyka restored only as a result of the adoption of resolute, urgent measures making it possible to create a truly fair socialist society where wealth is distributed according to labor.

I include among the emergency measures first of all the immediate submission to the upcoming USSR Supreme Soviet session of the changes dictated by life. Laws on the socialist enterprise and the cooperative movement, a temporary restriction of wholesale trade in the sphere of industry and construction, the implementation of a price reform and an exchange of banknotes on the basis of a declaration of income, the establishment of an obstacle to unjustified growth in wages, and the adoption of tougher laws making it possible to step up the struggle against crime. Up to 3,000-4,000 people are detained in the city each day for various offenses, including petty speculation. We detain them then release them, since the most we can do is to draw up a report on an administrative offense and send it to the detainee's place of residence. Incidentally, over 30 percent of detainees come from outside the city.

Democracy certainly does not mean total license, and the state's controlling functions have still not lost their importance in any country, even the most democratic. But in our country you get the impression that certain legislators are more worried about a humane attitude toward criminals than about protecting the interests, rights, and dignity of honest Soviet people.

Finally, we must clearly define priorities in the development of the country's national economy, preventing the scattering and dissipation of resources, and give real and tangible priority to the housing problem, to the socioeconomic sphere, and to filling the stores with food and industrial goods. Is it really so urgent today, in a period of economic collapse, to start constructing a new complex of the Moscow Higher Technical College named for Bauman—now the technical university—costing over R1 billion? I am sure that the people will appreciate it if we find some other use for these colossal state funds, a use worthier of today's hard times. Those are my practical proposals.

Now for matters of theory. We must stop rushing from side to side and producing pseudo-scientific publications. We need a concept of modern socialism. People are tired of the juggling with the concepts "socialism-capitalism" and with the concept "perestroyka" whereby any meaning is arbitrarily attached to them according to secret political goals and political ambitions.

Unfortunately, the huge scientific potential of the party and its institutes and educational establishments has not yielded results in the elaboration of a concept. What should we borrow from the contemporary solutions and achievements, especially economic achievements, of many countries of the world? For instance, how is the question of private ownership to be resolved and within what limits? How are the market and state regulation to be implemented? The delay in decisions on these cardinal questions has meant that the interests either of the state or of the broad people's masses have now been infringed to suit the economic interests of present-day smart operators. We need a concept, we need a nationwide referendum on questions of ownership and other vital problems of socialism.

In the struggle against deformations of socialism we have allowed socialism itself to be trampled into the mud and its values, real achievements, and deeds to be expunged from the consciousness of a certain section of the people, especially young people. We are schooling young people in dishonest business and schooling them out of creative work. We have presented the lives of people of the older generation as an unbroken sequence of mistakes and have made them the culprits for all today's troubles and difficulties in life.

The breeding of disbelief in socialism and in its attractiveness to the people and the identification of socialism with violence, terror, the administrative-edict system, and the omnipotence of the party and the bureaucracy are the sources of many of today's contradictions and decisions.

For five years now the image of socialism created in the press has been dinned into the people's minds from movie screens, on television, from the variety stage, in theaters, and not only from street platforms but sometimes from the platform of the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, and it is prompting decisions and situations like those in Lithuania and other regions.

The struggle against the administrative-edict system and bureaucratism is being exploited as a form of struggle for power, for the removal of the CPSU from the political arena and for the establishment of a new power—one possessing all the attributes of the administrative-edict style but implanted now by the new left radical leaders. If we want—and judging by the submitted draft platform we do—the CPSU to retain its status as ruling party by winning votes in the elections, we must immediately define its relationship both with the party press and with such leaders. The party press must reflect the party's ideas and the party's policy and clearly set out the party's views on history and the present day.

And if other press organs have a different viewpoint, let them engage in polemics with the party press. Only in such conditions will the broad masses be able to see what are the party's ideas and what are alien ideas and to make a conscious choice.

The party and the leaders of its Central Committee must adopt and express a clear position on all fundamental questions. Ambiguity can no longer be tolerated. It may lead to irretrievable consequences.

In this connection I propose that the CPSU Central Committee Plenum's position on one of the focal questions be formulated more clearly: the question of a multiparty system and Article 6 of the Constitution. I think that the whole logic of perestroyka has led to pluralism, not only ideological but also political pluralism. And to pretend that this is not so, that we are merely approaching a multiparty system, looks like a pointless game. A multiparty system has essentially arisen. And today we should not cling with both hands to the chair of the one-party system and waste effort on retaining the accustomed priority of power but free our hands and above all our heads for formulating an emergency economic policy, for work among the masses, for re-forming the party ranks, and for reviving the party's good name. We will gain more than we lose.

Speaking about the renewed role of the party in the Soviet system, I want to note that countless social movements, funds, associations, and unions are growing rapidly. This boom will continue for the next few years, and it is an inevitable process. But it must not become an avalanche sweeping aside everything in its path. At present idlers and adventurists living on the people's charity often find refuge under the roof of social formations. We must expedite the adoption of a law on social organizations, on parties, a law removing the unhealthy clamor surrounding these problems and placing everything on a strictly legal footing. The bricks in the foundation of the rule-of-law state must be created and laid in good time. Here too we are lagging behind and groping along. the adoption of laws must outstrip social development and work for the future.

There are now many arguments about discipline, its meaning, and the correlation between democracy and centralism. I am convinced that power must be strong and capable of integrating the interests of various social groups. But it must also heed the voice of the minority and display a respectful attitude toward different viewpoints. I believe that to this end we must persistently work to mold the legal culture of all strata of society, and this is one of the main tasks of the party and the state.

Finally, about the federation issue. I support the tenet in the CPSU Central Committee platform regarding the party's commitment to the Leninist principle of the right of nations to self-determination up to and including secession. Yes, we must elaborate and in the immediate future adopt a law on the mechanism for exercising this right. We must give each union republic the real right to self-determination up to and including secession on the basis of the law and of the expression of the people's will. The party must perform its duty and persuade people of the impermissibility of separatist movements. But what certainly must not be created is the impression that the union, by which people often mean Russia, is "holding on and not letting go" so far as anyone is concerned. May our union continue to remain a voluntary community of republics that want to live in cooperation with each other and in cooperation with Russia. What sort of a practice is it whereby we place Russia, not the smallest or most helpless of union republics, in the position of having to "wheedle and request"?

Russia does not lay claim to an exclusive position. It wants to be really an equal among equals, really a sovereign republic among sovereign republics. Russia cannot be placed above the other republics, but we can no longer tolerate Russia's curtailed sovereignty. A question that has already been raised here is that of why an extremely large republic like Russia, with a party organization numbering many millions of members, has no party Central Committee. Clearly, Russia's Communists ought to decide in the very near future what their party organ ought to be: the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau or a party Central Committee.

One last point. I am not a panicmonger and do not want to overdramatize things, but I am not filled with optimism in the present situation. Optimism is strengthened neither by the processes taking place in our country, nor by those taking place in European countries. My heart is full of pain over the fate of the motherland, and the pain sharpens particularly during meetings and conversations with representatives of the older generation and war and labor veterans who endured all the hardships and adversities of the war and the building of socialism. There can be no more waiting. The party must adopt resolute measures in both the economy and politics instead of the halfhearted measures adopted hitherto. The time has come for this, and it is the most crucial time. The fate of the motherland, the fate of the party will depend on it. The people will not forgive us for any delay.

Maslyukov Address on Lithuania

PM0902141990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 6

[Debate speech by Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Comrades! Following your decision, during the period 8 through 10 January I went with a group of CPSU Central Committee members and also specialists from the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and from sectors of industry to visit a whole series of enterprises in various cities of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and to hold meetings in city and rayon party committees and with the party aktiv of enterprises, in which representatives of both parties participated.

What can be and need to be pointed out? The fact that during the meetings which were held, including at the republic Council of Ministers, with leaders of enterprises, with representatives of the Gosplan, and with leading workers of the republic's central economic departments and of economic science, at city party committees, and at enterprises, there was a free exchange of opinions, a very sharp exchange, at times hard-hitting and critical, sometimes even self-critical, but at the same time it was basically a constructive exchange of opinions.

Where an enterprise, particularly a large enterprise, works for the interests of the entire Soviet Union, and where the proportion of the Russian-speaking population is relatively great, the talk was usually of the search for a solution as to how to emerge from the situation that has been created. At a number of other enterprises which we visited, on the contrary, purely separatist slogans prevailed, such as, for example, "Give freedom and independence back to Lithuania"; "Lenin gave Lithuania independence, Stalin took it away, and Gorbachev?"; "No to the Soviet empire"; "Down with the occupiers"; "Get into your tanks and drive home."

We sensed very well how great the indoctrination of the population had been, particularly along the routes selected for our delegation in certain cities. Comrade Kuptsov has already spoken of this, incidentally, and he and I together visited the city of Klaypeda and felt and saw all this there.

"Sajudis'" leadership of the activities of all informal organizations is clearly traceable. And it is my personal opinion that "Sajudis" had a considerable hand in splitting the Lithuanian Communist Party. This is expressed not only in the platform and in the slogans but also in its everyday activity, which contributes in one way or another to the fanning of nationalist ideas and to speculation on historical events which not all of us are old enough to have witnessed [kotoryye my s vami ne vse zastali].

The image of "occupiers" in the person of the Soviet Union and non-Lithuanian-speaking citizens of Lithuania is being actively molded. This is already affecting people's sentiments, even in those enterprises where there is a minimal number of Russian speakers. Thus, during my visit to the "Sirius" Plant, which makes power elements for electric appliances, a worker came up to me and asked: "Tell me, what will happen to the Russian-speaking population? Where am I to travel to? Where am I to go?" That is, the mood of a certain section of the population is, quite frankly, close to panic, and this, too, must be pointed out.

In addition, the mass media, which mainly belong, of course, to those who champion the position of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the new platform, are exerting a very extensive influence on the shaping of all these views. The delegation's visit was portrayed as the "arrival of hawks" "wishing to peck a peaceful dove to death."

As for news media reflecting the positions of the Communist Party which has remained on the CPSU platform, I have not seen any and, in my opinion, there are none. This conclusion can be drawn from the exchange of opinions and the meetings with comrades.

To proceed. All the news media in the republic constantly emphasize that there is a lack of perestroyka processes in the CPSU. Dissociation from the CPSU is seen as the only possibility of enhancing the Lithuanian Communist Party's prestige and ensuring its influence in society. On the whole, the essence of perestroyka processes boils down to Lithuania's national isolation and secession from the USSR.

At the same time a section of communists openly advocates enhancing the autonomy of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform and strengthening the sovereignty of republics in the USSR. This position is characteristic of multinational party organizations and labor collectives and also of rayons where there is a high concentration of non-Lithuanians.

Against the background of this situation on 15 January this year the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet took new steps aimed at breaking off federative relations with the USSR, including abrogating the USSR Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR and the USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the transfer of the Savings Bank to the jurisdiction of the USSR State Bank on its territory.

At the same time, comrades, it is no coincidence, I believe, that the very dangerous fairytale has appeared that Lithuania is supposedly being subjected to an economic blockade by the USSR. I believe that many comrades want to make very good capital out of this wave to advance their own ideas. The idea of an economic blockade of Lithuania by enterprises in other parts of the country was also expressed at a conference at the republic Council of Ministers, at which practically all directors of large enterprises, representatives of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers and Gosplan, and leading economists gathered. At the same time they tried to convince me that in no circumstances does Lithuania intend to secede from the USSR but, on the contrary, it must strengthen ties with suppliers from other republics. The next day, however, the situation changed abruptly, and a discussion began in the presence of Mikhail Sergeyevich to the effect that Lithuania's secession from the Soviet Union is the only way out.

This means that when they speak of the economy, they understand one thing, but when they speak of political processes they start saying something else. But calculations and logic lead to the conclusion that on the economic plane Lithuania, particularly during the first years, cannot run things autonomously, and this will be to the huge detriment of the whole Soviet Union, and I would even say that it will be another Chernobyl in terms of losses. For Lithuania this could spell serious economic collapse, which it would take the republic several decades to overcome. We conveyed this viewpoint to everyone with whom we talked and met. It has to be said that in general it meets with understanding. The question of the rapid modernization and reprofiling of the basic sectors of industry in Lithuania has also been formulated groundlessly, because Lithuania's basic science-intensive sectors are far from being at an advanced technical level, although they are higher than in certain republics of the Soviet Union. I would like to say once again that specialization and production sharing on in the country's national economic complex is an accomplished fact. The need to make changes in this sphere and the elimination of monopolism do not have to be demonstrated, but this can only be done by means of purposeful joint efforts.

Of course, if we were to visit Lithuania after today's plenum, which has discussed the platform and adopted a whole number of very important decisions, particularly in the sphere of the federative building of the USSR and the granting of greater practical autonomy to the republics' Communist Parties, many questions would probably be removed. But at the time of our stay in Lithuania in January there still existed a syndrome of mistrust toward us when we were informing citizens of the basic positions and thoughts. The impression was created that the platform of the autonomous Lithuanian Communist Party has moved far away from the CPSU's positions.

Today I see the way out of the present situation as lying in the rapprochement of the positions of Lithuania's Communists on the basis of the draft platform which the plenum has approved for discussion at the 28th CPSU Congress.

Today there is still a possibility of attentively studying this document, which has been prepared and will evidently be finally presented within the next few days, and assessing the situation once again. Of course, I soberly realize that the actions of the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership have introduced a split into our country's Communist movement, and I believe that this must definitely be reflected in the decision. But, at the same time, I urge the plenum participants to show definite restraint in the conclusions connected with this. I believe that the documents adopted today provide a basis and one more opportunity for consolidating the forces of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the new platform and of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU platform. And very great, good work must be done, I believe, before the 28th congress.

At the same time, in no circumstances must we leave the Lithuanian Communist Party which adheres to the CPSU position in the helpless state in which it finds itself today. We must take all necessary measures to ensure that they have their own base, their own cadres, and, most importantly, the right to vote, and they need mass media.

From economic positions I believe that the provisions of the draft platform, the government program, and also the draft Council of Ministers resolution on priority measures to switch the Baltic republics to economic autonomy and self-management, including the transfer of some enterprises of union subordination to republic jurisdiction and the resolution of practically all questions connected with foreign economic activity, open up a very wide road before them.

And, incidentally, we are not closing the road to the further expansion of the volume and the powers being transferred to the republic. This is an important aspect of the question which must be well thought out and correctly presented to the republic's population.

The final point, comrades, that I would like to make. I believe that the Supreme Soviet—in which connection I address Mikhail Sergeyevich as chairman of the Supreme Soviet—must clearly think out how to correctly reflect questions of preserving the union's integrity in those laws which will be adopted. Of course, our federation's unity must remain the basis for discussion.

Today we have spoken of the rules of secession and of the rights of each republic to autonomy. In my view, the first part must consist in how to preserve the federation and on what conditions it is possible to undertake treaty relations, but very serious treaty relations. And only after this to consider a law on the rules of secession for a soviereign republic which desires this—and a referendum must confirm this secession from the Soviet Union. All these questions are now to be examined.

Klautsen Warns of Opposition Strength

PM0902162790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Debate speech by A.P. Klautsen, first secretary of Riga Latvian Communist Party City Committee, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Communists and working people not only in Lithuania but also in other regions await the decision of today's plenum on this question [Lithuanian CP autonomy]. It is a complex decision. It will be of great significance for our region and, I believe, for other regions of the country. In my view, the version of this decision proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev is acceptable. The development of events in the Baltic region is, as you know, following a similar scenario with, of course, its own special features. Therefore, in my speech I will speak about the affairs not of the Lithuanian republic but of our republic, intending, of course, to help the plenum participants to gain a deeper understanding of the situation with our southern neighbors in connection with the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress.

I will dwell on two questions—first of all, the distribution of forces in the political arena. Speaking from this rostrum yesterday, Academician Velikhov expressed the opinion that there is no force in the country today that could set up in competition with the CPSU.

While deeply respecting Yevgeniy Pavlovich and realizing that it is a thankless task to argue with academicians, I will say that in this case he is profoundly mistaken. Such forces exist, have declared their presence, and are well organized. It is simply impossible not to see this today.

In our republic the Latvian People's Front constitutes a real opposition to the Communist Party. Formed at the first stage of perestroyka on a wave of democratization and glasnost on the one hand and on a wave of growing national self-awareness on the other, in its slogans the republic People's Front sang the praises of perestroyka, the name of Gorbachev, and renewal. While permitting criticism of the ideas of socialism and of the activity of our union as a unitarian state, on the whole it supported revolutionary transformations in society.

However, as early as the second congress of the People's Front last fall—and this movement is, quite frankly, heterogeneous in its composition—its right wing gained the upper hand within it in the shape of the movement for Latvian national independence, which in its program overtly set the task of restoring the statehood which had existed prior to 1940. That is, the virtual restoration of the bourgeois system. Soon after their congress the leaders of the People's Front publicly declared the Latvian Communist Party their enemy. Today there is the process of the People's Front leaders' withdrawal from the CPSU and a call for the self-disbandment of the republic Communist Party.

The front's leaders declare that the Latvian People's Front is not a party, but a movement. At the same time it has a clear-cut organizational structure with rigid discipline. Sessions of the leading organs are held, as a rule, behind closed doors. The decisions adopted are subject to unquestioning fulfillment.

In short, they have adopted those undemocratic forms and methods of party work which we are today being urged to abandon. In particular, Comrade Yeltsin spoke about this the day before yesterday, also speaking from this rostrum. Rejecting the proposed CPSU Central Committee platform, Boris Nikolayevich advanced a new one, whose realization would lead to the virtual collapse of the CPSU, not to its reform. And to the creation of another, very diffuse party which, of course, could not remain the ruling party.

In this case not only do he and his supporters fail to take account of our party's historic past and Lenin's teaching on the party, but they also fail to notice the experience of new movements, particularly in our region, which are struggling for real power today.

And it has to be said that this struggle is not without success for the People's Front today. Thus, in last year's elections to the country's Supreme Soviet and in this year's to the local soviets it achieved victory in the republic as a whole. In the city of Riga, in particular, the majority of rayon soviet people's deputies today are representatives of the People's Front.

Some comrades will say: So what? If you have been unable to cope, fresh forces will come to the leadership. They will be able to resolve urgent problems in a more qualitative way and to champion their people's interests.

By no means. The newly elected soviets most frequently seek to show their worth in another way. Let us take a seemingly secondary fact. Anyone who has visited our region recently and been, in particular, with our neighbors in Vilnius cannot have failed to notice that much or everything connected with Lenin, with the history of the Soviet period, or with Marxism has disappeared from the names of streets, avenues, and squares.

Something similar is coming to us, too. The just-elected deputies of the Leninskiy Rayon soviet, for example, launched a campaign at their first session to rename not an individual street but their entire rayon.

In principle, it would seem, there is no need to make a tragedy out of this. After all, a name is an abstraction. Yet the renaming of streets is just a link in the chain of social and political transformations.

An open, cynical attack on our humane gains and on the way of life has begun. Thus, on the initiative of a number of journalists the question has recently been raised that our front-line soldiers and the Lettish legionnaires who fought on the side of German fascism should enjoy identical benefits.

This is not to mention those facts that are known to the plenum participants—in the sphere of legislation in our republics, in which citizens' rights are infringed—or the situation that is taking shape, in particular, with regard to the Soviet Army.

That is, a new morality is today practically knocking on our door.

The preparations for the elections to the republic Supreme Soviet are now gathering momentum. It is no secret that the Latvian People's Front has set the task of achieving a majority in the republic's parliament and then securing a change to the existing social system by parliamentary means. They seem to be trying to reassure us.

And what of the republic Communist Party under these conditions? I will say frankly that the Communist Party is yielding its positions and being sluggish and slow, whereas the People's Front's supporters are exerting increasingly substantial influence on the activity of all the republic's leading organs, including the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, and even the Central Committee of the republic Communist Party.

To be fair, it has to be said that the republic Communist Party Central Committee is taking measures to strengthen the communists' influence on the state of affairs. In particular, proceeding from an analysis of the situation and relying on numerous proposals from party organizations, the Latvian Communist Party's action program was adopted last August.

Last month's plenum of the republic Communist Party Central Committee marked the start of active preparations for the next, 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress. However, in the very first days after that plenum a group of communists who disagreed with its decisions announced the creation of an organizing committee to reinstate an "independent" republic Communist Party. A date was nominated to hold a conference of its supporters. It is possible to say that we, just like our neighbors, are on the threshold of a split in the party in the republic. I do not think the situation is any better with our northern neighbors.

This is one aspect of our existence. Now about the second block of reasons for today's failures. Clearly, we all frequently ask ourselves the question: What has happened to the peoples or the people who for decades were supporters of socialism and active builders of the new society? Why is everything suddenly being turned around abruptly in their world outlook in a short space of time? Public opinion and society's values are changing before our eyes. Today already a large section of the republic's population mistrusts Marxist-Leninist ideology and socialism, and there is a growing negative attitude to the CPSU and our union.

Nothing in this life, in this world, happens of its own accord. Much lies in our past. However, the chief question is still, I believe, who has his hands on the very important lever which influences the shaping of public opinion. I mean the mass media. Whoever controls them influences the people's mood and turns them.

Having proclaimed democratization and glasnost and condemned the monopoly on the mass media, the party has gone no further in developing the processes.

I can say, taking the republic as an example, that the Latvian Communist Party's monopoly in this important sector has today virtually been transferred to other forces, namely to supporters of the Latvian People's Front.

Let us ask ourselves a question. If the values of socialism are criticized day after day, for a year or two, on radio and television and in the pages of the press, will people remain indifferent? Of course not. Particularly if this is done professionally, efficiently, and in an organized manner. Communists frequently rebuke us with failing to exert the necessary influence on the work of the mass media. They are right in many ways.

At the same time, I believe, it is not only a question of ourselves. Not so long ago—at a meeting in the Higher All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League School, I think—esteemed Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev voiced the opinion that the mass media only reflect objectively those processes that take place in real life.... But, strictly speaking, Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev also confirmed this same thought yesterday.

I can use the republic's example to declare that they do not so much reflect as shape in the required direction. This has always been the case, and it is the case today, too. Clearly, it was no coincidence, if you recall the events in East Europe and in Romania in particular, that precisely the television building was one of the most important targets in the initial battle.

A final point. We say a lot about negative aspects of our perestroyka, we record facts of interethnic strife in various parts of the country, and we note the growth in manifestations of nationalism, chauvinism, and separatism in others. And we say very little about why this is happening and who specifically is causing the destabilization of society.

The situation in the Baltic region is not special, because it incporates processes which are occurring in our society as a whole. Without an honest, in-depth analysis, without specific addresses for the causes of negative phenomena, it is impossible to formulate measures to stabilize the situation in the country and to halt society's slide toward crisis and collapse.

Yershova Calls for Communist Protection

PM0902162090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Debate speech by N.M. Yershova, member of the CPSU Central Committee and fitter at the F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Machine Building Plant Production Association, Perm, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Comrades! What made me mount this platform? As a working person, I am amazed and delighted by how much attention Mikhail Sergeyevich, the Politburo members, and the Central Committee members have devoted to the question of examining the situation in Lithuania. But none of this was correctly interpreted. Neither goodness, nor decency—no conclusions were drawn.

Just before leaving to come to the plenum I received a telegram: "To Comrade Yershova, Dzerzhinskiy Plant Production Association, Perm. Please give your support at the plenum to Lithuania's communists who adhere to the CPSU platform, we are being persecuted." (The speaker then gave the name and address of the sender of the telegram.) That is the telegram I received.

What is it that makes me indignant? Surely it is clear from all this that the political games, Comrade Brazauskas, must stop.

The communists, the Soviet people—everyone is waiting for the Central Committee to adopt a firm position on this question. It is incumbent on us to protect the communists and those who adhere to correct postiions, and to give a very firm and serious assessment at today's Central Committee plenum. And I think we should support the draft resolution read out by Mikhail Sergeyevich and incorporate the amendments put forward by the speakers. That is all I have to say.

Turkmen Drilling Foreman on Perestroyka

PM1202130090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 3

[Debate speech by A.B. Shalyyev, member of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission and drilling foreman at the "Turkmengazprom" Production Association, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Comrades, my opinion is also unequivocal. The past years have given us much. In the five years of perestroyka we have all undergone a tough political education. We have learned and are learning the exacting science of democracy and glasnost. Perestroyka, like anything new, constantly runs up against barriers and resistance.

The situation in the country at present is difficult. In many ways critical. But it has quite rightly been said that in this situation we should not panic or shout louder than everyone else, but pool our efforts and act. To that end a clear action program is needed. The political platform, clarifying our stance, is aimed at rallying the communists and mobilizing them to selfless work for the sake of the future of the party and of socialism.

The proposed draft platform meets these demands. It contains quite constructive proposals and conclusions, effective measures. Their implementation will require an energetic quest for unconventional approaches and solutions, which will make it possible to infuse a fresh spirit of change into every party organization and make every communist act energetically and uncompromisingly.

I am unequivocally in favor of the adoption of the proposed draft. But a platform of action is not in itself a guarantee of success. It is necessary more fully to uncover and exploit the reserves that exist in every region, more efficiently to utilize levers to ensure the better exploitation of a territory's potential.

The renewal process is proceeding evenly in our republic [Turkmenia], without excesses of passion. That has given rise to a steady trend of positive changes in the economy, the social sphere, and people's spiritual life and consciousness. Since the start of the five-year plan the growth in national income has already considerably exceeded the level achieved on the results of the whole of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

The quest for and implementation of nontraditional methods in the resolution of urgent social problems has meant that in the current five-year plan one-third more housing is being commissioned than the average for the years of the previous five-year plan. Nearly twice as many kindergartens and schools and three times as many hospitals are being commissioned. The rate of growth in consumer goods production has considerably outstripped the general increase in industrial production. The services sphere has increased by 50 percent. The moral atmosphere has become cleaner and people's sociopolitical activeness has increased. A graphic example of this is the results of the elections of people's deputies of the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic and the local soviets, held on 7 January of this year.

A new structure of soviet power has been created for the first time in the republic, and its activity will be characterized by an active parliamentary political life and the comparison of alternative opinions and drafts. The first session of the soviet has thus far confirmed this idea.

Of course, the results achieved do not entirely satisfy all of us. Problems persist, and our path is very difficult. The burden of unresolved social problems is particularly oppressive. Our main problems are the social laggardness of the countryside, demographic imbalances, the high proportion of unemployment among the working-age population, and perhaps more than anywhere else the position of women. Hence the high level of child and maternal mortality.

Of course, it was not perestroyka that called these and other problems into being. They were accumulating over the decades, but it was in the course of perestroyka that they began to be keenly perceived. People have developed a feeling of impatience which it is very difficult to contain. It is therefore necessary to regard every problem as a potential source of social tension and to accelerate the adoption of concrete decisions.

The formulation and adoption of the Law on the Socialist Enterprise should be accelerated, so that economic accountability can operate at republican level. It should become firmly established at grass-roots level and begin to produce returns there. The existing Law on the State Enterprise is full of contradictions. Our basic production component has not yet gained full autonomy. Labor collectives continue to work and to plan their future on the basis of what has already been achieved, and supplies could not be worse. The existing uncertainty and lack of clear legal guarantees has given rise to the fear syndrome in people.

I know from my own experience that it is hard to attract people to the idea of joining a cooperative and leasing a shop or sector. I am saying this at the plenum because I see not only the legal and economic aspects of this question. These questions are highly charged with major political, social, moral, scientific, and technical changes.

I think the problem raised can be perceived and examined only in broad terms. The fate of perestroyka depends not only on economic prosperity, but on the general moral and political situation within our fraternal home. We are deeply worried by the state of interethnic relations and the national conflicts and clashes between national groups that are arising in various regions of the country.

This carries the risk of a chain reaction. Because, as life shows, we too have adherents of the nationalist idea. Pursuing their own selfish interests, they try to play on the people's national feelings and pride.

I believe that only the path proposed in the draft CPSU Central Committee platform, the path of renewal of our federation and formation of relations between nations and national groups that are equal and based on true mutual respect, can and should be the guarantee of the creation of a democratic society that meets the demands of the rights and norms of man and of peoples. It is necessary to proceed very firmly and steadily. It must not be forgotten that our strength lies in unity and fraternity.

I am convinced that the only force capable of leading us out of the situation that has arisen to new heights of socialism is the party. But not the party as it is today—a reborn party, a true organization of political fighters. The kind of party that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke of in his report.

Comrades, while advocating the increased autonomy of all CPSU components, I resolutely reject the idea of turning the CPSU into a confederation of union republics' parties. The CPSU must remain a single, international party with a single Program and Statutes. Only this kind of party can lead us to new heights and pursue the difficult path of transformations. The primary party organizations must rise to the level of a political leadership that really influences the state of affairs. Only they can ensure success. The fragmentation that has become established today, the diversity of uncoordinated actions by party organizations, lead to the scattering of resources and the further complication of many problems that have become urgent or even overdue. We must think about the formulation of the platform with a view to conveying the political essence, the full complexity and diversity of precongress work, to every party cell and every communist.

In short, an enormous volume of work must be done in a very short space of time. And here it is very important not to lose the thread and become bogged down in trivialities. In this connection one can support the idea that it is sensible to form a special organ that could be instructed to lead and coordinate all work in preparing for the congress and to involve in this work a wide aktiv from among the delegates who will be elected to the 28th congress. This will meet with understanding in the party and will be greeted with great approval. I am convinced that the creation of guarantees of the resolution of all the tasks facing the party and their formulation and elaboration in the precongress platform will promote the party's recovery and increase its role in organizing the work of leading the country out of the crisis.

Burokyavichyus on Socialist Renewal

PM0902151590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Debate speech by M.M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Provisional Central Committee, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Comrades! The CPSU Central Committee draft platform for the 28th Party Congress is a good basis for discussing the problems of the renewal of socialism in Soviet Lithuania.

We are grateful to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the members of the Politburo and Central Committee of the CPSU who visited the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. I think that they were all convinced of the complexity of the situation in Lithuania.

I agree with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's thorough analysis and evaluation of the situation in Soviet Lithuania. At the present CPSU Central Committee February Plenum I want to express some of my views on the main political question—Lithuania's future development path. The communist movement in Lithuania is also connected with that question.

The situation in Lithuania did not ease after Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the members of the Politburo and the Central Committee of the CPSU left Lithuania. That is shown by the materials of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee January Plenum, which reaffirmed the Lithuanian Communist Party's de facto withdrawal from the CPSU.

The republic's party leadership understands the Lithuanian Communist Party's independence and restructuring as meaning its separation from the CPSU and sees the new realities of life in Lithuania in the creation of an independent Lithuanian state outside the Soviet Union. As the documents show, the separatist wing of the Lithuanian Communist Party does not recognize the socialist statehood of the Lithuanian SSR. You have had an opportunity to see that for yourselves today. It advocates the restoration of the statehood which existed in Lithuania before the victory of the revolutionary forces in 1940. The conservative forces' desire to restore Lithuania's past can be seen from the documents both of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress and of its other forums, in which all who were "involved in the Lithuanian nation's loss of statehood" are condemned and which states that "active assistance... in eliminating the Lithuanian nation's statehood in 1940 is a crime." That is how the revolutionary, antifascist forces of the Lithuanian people who restored Soviet power in Lithuania in 1940 are assessed.

The idea has been suggested that only a Lithuanian Communist Party independent of the CPSU can lead to the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state.

We believe that the separation of a large section of Lithuania's communists from the CPSU is a blow against the long-standing revolutionary and internationalist positions of the Lithuanian Communist Party and a rejection of the ideological and organizational unity of Lithuania's communists with the communist organizations of Russia and the communist parties of the union republics.

For a long time the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership hid its separatist actions and misled not only the CPSU Central Committee leadership but also Lithuania's communists.

The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee January Plenum materials show that the main aim is to create an independent Lithuanian state outside the USSR. At the Central Committee January Plenum, Romualdas Ozalas, a member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and a leader of "Sajudis," said: "The creation of a mechanism for withdrawal from the USSR is the personal problem of M.S. Gorbachev or that part of the Soviet Union which will remain after the separation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. It is not USSR internal law but international law which should be applied to us. Therefore our cause is simple," Ozalas went on: "It is to calculate how much the Soviet Union owes Lithuania and present the bill to Moscow."

But Comrade Brazauskas said that people from "Sajudis" are joining the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, and there is one of them for you.

A package of laws has also been prepared, comrades, on the repeal of the historic acts of the Lithuanian People's Sejm on the proclamation of Soviet power in Lithuania and the entry of the Lithuanian SSR into the Soviet Union, which will be submitted by leaders of "Sajudis" and members of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to the February session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. I think that this question is already under discussion today.

This position of the separatist forces is at variance with the historical truth. In the first place, Lithuania joined the USSR on a legal basis. Second, the events of summer 1940 were not connected with the 1939 treaties between Germany and the USSR.

At the 16th session of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet in January 1990, Kazimeras Moteka, a member of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and a "Sajudis" leader, said in his report that "the USSR as a union of states is a pure fiction," that the union was created "by means of conquest and the enslavement of other peoples and states with their subsequent 'voluntary' entry into the USSR," that a union of sovereign states in a federative state "is nothing more than theatre of the absurd enacted in international law and in view of the entire democratic world," that "the present-day Soviet Union is not a union but an obvious colonial, unitary state," that "people are saying increasingly confidently that the USSR is the world's last colonial empire," and that the "colonialist policy of Tsarist Russia, defined accurately long ago as the prison of the peoples, is vigilantly being protected even now." Can we really accept K. Moteka's position? Soviet Russia's positive role in the development of the USSR should not be forgotten. I am deeply convinced that anyone who now sows hostility toward the Russian nation and wants to split the Lithuanian people from the Russian and other peoples of the USSR is laying a trap for the Lithuanian people. You can love your people, take pride in its traditions, wish it well, and strive for its happiness only by respecting the Soviet Union.

On the basis of K. Moteka's report the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution which says that the USSR Law on Constitutional Oversight is inoperative on Lithuanian SSR territory from the day of its adoption. This resolution of the republic's Supreme Soviet was signed by Comrade Algirdas Brazauskas as Chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Looking back at 1989, you will see that this is not the only resolution suspending the operation of USSR laws on Soviet Lithuanian territory. The constitutional conflict between the Lithuanian SSR and the Soviet Union is generally being created artificially so as to set the Lithuanian SSR's population against the Soviet Union and to use national sentiments, of which the Lithuanian people are proud, to arouse nationalism and exploit it for narrow selfish aims. These separatist, antisocialist forces are being objectively helped to achieve their goals by the inactivity of the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership.

Yes, a serious rebuke. But such is the history of the development of Lithuania's reality. My conclusion is derived from an analysis of the events which began in the second half of November 1988 in Lithuania. After all, it was then that concessions began to be made to the separatist, nationalist, and antisocialist forces in all areas of Lithuania's social life.

Why have I raised this question? To show that the causes of the complex political situation in Lithuania include mistakes of a political and ideological character made by the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership. After all, the idea of reconstructing an independent Lithuanian state outside the USSR has gripped significant strata of the Lithuanian population and a particularly large section of young people. This idea is being propagandized by other opposition forces besides "Sajudis," and they are supported by members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee.

At the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee January Plenum, Yanina Gagilene, a member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and first secretary of the Leninskiy party rayon committee in Vilnius, stated that the aims of all the movements and parties coincide in many respects with the aims of the Lithuanian Communist Party and noted that only one party opposes Lithuanian independence, so that therefore the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU Platform) cannot be given the same status as all the other movements and parties. But Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau member R. Ozolas said at this Central Committee plenum: "In my view the CPSU, as a party alien to Lithuania, is already actively trying to seize power now."

What can I say on that question? Ya. Gagilene is right in saying that the present policy of the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership outside the CPSU fully coincides with the policy of the parties and organizations which adhere to nationalist and antisocialist positions. But she is wrong in saying that the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) appears as a party opposed to Lithuanian statehood.

We believe that the real socialist state sovereignty of the Lithuanian SSR is possible within the Soviet Union and that the federative organization of the USSR will be renewed in the Leninist sense, and for that reason that we defend the Lithuanian SSR's development within the USSR. This is the main question which divides Lithuanian communists into two sections. There can be no compromise between us on this question. On other questions perhaps, but on this one—no way. Because we support a Lithuania within the Soviet Union.

We urge the Lithuanian Communist Party leadership with its program and statute to publicly and clearly state that they, too, support Lithuania's development within the USSR. Do those Lithuanians who are in power really think that perestroyka means the destruction of the Soviet Union? History will never forgive anyone such steps.

Communists belonging to the CPSU in Lithuania are alarmed for the fate of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform). They ask us many questions: Why does the CPSU Central Committee not express its clear position on the CPSU party organizations in Lithuania. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report today has already expressed the position on that question. We are very grateful.

A distinction is now being drawn between communists and party organizations in terms of platforms. This is a natural process and stems from the grass roots. The Lithuanian Communist Party outside the CPSU, guided by its statute, is accelerating the creation of its party structures from primary party organizations through to rayon and city organizations and is electing delegates to rayon party conferences.

Communists belonging to the CPSU are also shaping their party structures. The Vilnius, Shyaulyay, and Alitus Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform) City Committees have been formed. Organizing committees have been created in Kaunas and Klaypeda cities and in a number of rural rayons and are preparing city and rayon party conferences. On 20 January 1990 there was a republican conference of the party aktiv, mainly representing party organizations in the rural rayons, where the absolute majority of the Lithuanian population lives. Those communists declared that they would consistently defend the CPSU line.

I would also ask you to bear in mind that we are working in special conditions. Conditions in which the newly created Lithuanian Communist Party, by which I mean the one headed by Comrade Algirdas Brazauskas, put into practice its more democratic statutes [statut], that is, its charter [ustav]. Therefore, we ask the CPSU Central Committee to resolve a number of questions of party life more flexibly, in accordance with our republic's prevailing conditions, because under the existing CPSU Statutes we cannot promptly resolve the urgent questions in the life of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform). But the most important thing is that the CPSU Central Committee Plenum's documents should recognize the functioning of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform). The report delivered by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev today spoke about this. Unless there is support for the policy of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform), a clear attitude to CPSU party organizations in Lithuania, and steps to ensure the social protection of CPSU members in Lithuania, the CPSU in Lithuania will lose tens of thousands of communists. And in so doing the political base of the CPSU Central Committee in Lithuania will contract, the political strength of the CPSU in Lithuania will weaken considerably, and the CPSU's political influence on the consciousness of Lithuanian SSR citizens will decline. This will deepen the political crisis in the republic still further.

As for the crisis within the Lithuanian Communist Party, it exists because the Communist Party has split into two wings. There are many complex questions before the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform). Because there have been great deformations of socialism, and attempts are being made to discredit the very idea of socialism, too. Therefore, it is very important for us to show the ways to renew socialist society and the essence of perestroyka, to protect the Lithuanian people's history from distortion, and to pay tribute to the achievements of Lithuania's spiritual culture during the years of Soviet power.

There is also a nationalities question in Lithuania. This alarms the majority of people among the Russian and Polish populations resident on Lithuanian territory. There have been a great many complaints of injustice. Many people, especially those of Russian nationality, are frightened by the situation which has taken shape in Lithuania. The state status of the Lithuanian language has been defined, but the legal status of the Russian and Polish languages in Lithuania has not been resolved. The republic's Communist Party leadership proved incapable of resolving these questions.

In conclusion, I want to say that there are in fact two communist parties in Lithuania and the CPSU Central Committee should evaluate the situation in Soviet Lithuania correctly and recognize their existence. But at the same time there should be a principled assessment of the documents of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress.

The Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform) has a social base in the republic. Its ranks will grow. Its political weight in the republic's life will also gradually increase. Taking into account the republic's national specifics, it will pursue a policy which meets the interests of the Lithuanian people and the peoples living on Lithuanian SSR territory and the interests of the entire Soviet Union.

I would ask the CPSU Central Committee Plenum to clarify the questions of the communist movement in Lithuania. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report gave a very clear assessment of the processes taking place in the communist movement in Lithuania. I would ask the CPSU Central Committee Plenum to adopt concrete decisions on the very complex questions of party life. Only the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU platform) will ensure its vigorous activity among Soviet Lithuania's working people.

Bashtanyuk on Party-Trade Union Relations

PM1202092190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Debate speech by G.S. Bashtanyuk, member of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the AUCCTU, at CPSU Central Committee Plenum 7 February]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! It is already obvious today that radical changes in the party are imminent and the need for them is of an extraordinary nature. In fact, this is also evidenced by the debate which has developed at this plenum. As a member of the Central Committee, I support, in the main, the CPSU Central Committee's draft platform for the 28th congress submitted to the plenum for discussion.

At the same time I wish to express some views which are also shared by my fellow participants in the plenum who work in trade unions.

Soviet people, communists and nonparty people, supported perestroyka above all because the party had proposed making man's interests the chief point of all the perestroyka processes. People believed in the planned changes. But life is becoming increasingly hard. This is having an adverse effect on people's mood, discipline is falling, and social tension is growing. Many comrades have spoken of this in their speeches.

Therefore both the party and the people now need a platform and an action program which can unite all the country's social forces and channel their efforts into achieving the goals of perestroyka as quickly as possible and surmounting the difficulties that have arisen. In particular, the platform must express more clearly and firmly the party's position with regard to the shadow economy, which, like an octopus, is entangling the country increasingly widely and giving rise to such negative phenomena as distortions in the cooperative movement, speculation, bribetaking, and organized crime. It is also increasing its influence on interethnic relations.

I wish to dwell particularly on relations between the party and the trade unions. We welcome the points contained in the draft platform to the effect that the party will build new relations with the trade unions on the principles of dialogue, discussion, cooperation, and partnership. This is very important today. Something else is worrying. I specially inquired of my older comrades, who have long been working in the trade unions, when was the last time the party's leaders met with the country's trade union aktiv. But no one could recall such an instance. Unless, of course, you count the trade union congresses. Given this attitude toward the trade unions, the desire to influence the activity of the most mass public organization through the communists working in it will remain at the level of a good idea.

Today we cannot build our relations along the lines of the old approaches which took shape in the structures of the administrative-edict system. Of course, there is no doubt that the unity of the party and the trade unions is an insistent demand of life and a very important condition for the success of perestroyka. Vladimir Ilich Lenin's warning still applies in full today: If the party splits with the trade unions, then the party is to blame. This means the end of Soviet power for sure.

The existing experience of a number of countries unambiguously attests that society's stability largely depends on the situation prevailing in the trade union movement. The trade unions' role and place in society today must be commensurate with the genuine revival of the country's workers movement and with the colossally increased activeness of the masses. The question is this: Either this energy of the working people which has burst forth will assume spontaneous forms and then the goals of perestroyka will be swept aside by the anarchy of chaos, or it will be of an organized nature and, consequently, will contribute to the country's renewal in conditions of order and tranquillity.

At the same time I do not wish to lay it on thick, but I must emphasize that the struggle for political influence among organized working people has already been begun by very different formations—from the Democratic Union to the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists. They have placed on the agenda the task of creating parallel trade union structures. Their emissaries travel around cities and enterprises, distribute various printed materials, and set up channels for giving material and financial assistance, including from abroad. They are increasingly trying to infiltrate worker collectives in order to paralyze the social structures now operating in them, party and trade union structures and labor collective councils, and to replace them with new ones geared to their own political ends.

If we give way to these forces and the party loses its prestige in the workers movement, this will do irreparable harm to perestroyka at its most crucial stage. There is no doubt that there is now a crisis of confidence in all social structures in the country, including the trade unions. The recent miners' strikes were the most alarming signal. They showed, in particular, that the trade unions lack not only persistence, but also the ability to champion the working people's vital interests.

The Sixth AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Plenum was devoted to the search for ways to overcome this situation, which are by no means easy. Its decisions were a serious step in revising the trade union positions which had taken shape over many decades.

We resolutely advocated the further democratization of the life of primary trade union organizations and their independence in determining the structure and shaping the budget. Support was given to the delegate principle of electing elected organs, and priority areas in our activity were defined. The plenum approved a number of specific measures concerning the most urgent problems of concern to people, which later became the subject of discussion at the last session of the country's Supreme Soviet and have already to a considerable degree found a positive solution.

A new mechanism of cooperation between the trade unions and the government is being set up, which will make it possible in the future to conclude agreements at the level of the Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU on the most important social problems affecting the vital interests of millions of the country's working people.

We are starting to take account of the lessons of the recent past. But let us frankly state that still not everyone, including in the party leadership, correctly understands the changes occurring in the trade unions or our resolute steps toward revising functional priorities.

I will cite just one example. Thus, Comrade Aleshin, second secretary of Orel party oblast committee, maintained in his speech at an oblast trade union conference that there was a certain amount of confusion at the Sixth AUCCTU Plenum. How, in his opinion, was this confusion manifested? In the fact that theoreticians and supporters of the trade unions' so-called independence, self-management, and partnership with party organs had turned up.

The speaker went on to attempt to prove that the trade unions in general do not need to change anything. In speaking like this, the party leader evidently had not yet felt the influence of the processes taking place in society. It is totally inadmissible today to reduce Lenin's vision of the trade unions' role and place in the renewed socialist society to the popular quotation about the drive belt. The trade unions must act independently, underpinned, above all, by their own primary structures, and be guided by the party's program documents, not by orders from individual bureaus or committees.

In other words, the switch to political methods of work with public organizations is not just desirable but a rigid necessity. This is not a forced retreat but a return to truly Leninist norms in work with the masses.

In this connection I propose including the following formula in the draft platform under discussion: "The party sees the trade unions as a self-motivating, independent public organization of working people, acting in their interests, for the protection of their labor and socioeconomic rights, and expressing the working people's desire for unity in the name of a better life. The party renounces its former image of the trade unions as a drive belt, a connecting link between the CPSU and the broad working masses, and it resolutely rejects the administrative-edict approach in relations with trade union organizations."

It is clear to everyone now that the credit of confidence obtained cannot be without time limit for the party. It is becoming increasingly obvious that we communists must confirm the party's vanguard role under the conditions of the growing processes of the democratization of society, while at the same time not aspiring to a monopoly on political power nor permitting organizational and ideological helplessness. Whether we want this or not, we will have to uphold our ideals under conditions of a tough political struggle. This is the whole purport of the activity and life of any party. Only in struggle, not in declarations, is it possible to secure the people's recognition and respect.

Yeltsin Interviewed on Party Plenum

LD1202231590 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 2030 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Interview granted by Boris Yeltsin to unidentified reporter in Pushkin Square, Moscow; date not specified; carried in the "Panorama" program; Yeltsin's remarks in Russian, with superimposed Hungarian translation—recorded; no video available]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Reporter] Why did you alone vote no at the plenum?

[Yeltsin] Why alone, or why no?

[Reporter] Why no?

[Yeltsin] There are many people who share my views, share my principles, but for the moment they do not dare to vote openly.

[Reporter] Was the resolution not radical enough?

[Yeltsin] Indeed it was not. I proposed in my speech that we should include 12 points into the draft platform. They accepted four—three in part, and did not include the others, which were very much questions of principle.

[Reporter] Which is the most important?

[Yeltsin] Fundamentally that they do not wish to allow the existence of platforms and factions within the party. This, by the way, is one of the ways of transferring to a multiparty system. A point of this nature should have been included, but this did not happen. Neither did the abolition of the principle of democratic centralism, although this is what ruined us in the past decades, and (?brought about) military discipline.

[Reporter] The discipline of the barracks?

[Yeltsin] Yes, the discipline of the barracks. Well, they did not include this either. Furthermore, they also did not include the changing and simplification of the structure of the party, the transition to a party without an apparatus, to a self-governing party, with the help of an elected organ. Furthermore, taking into account that today the composition of the Central Committee is conservative, at least 40 of the 58 speakers spoke in a conservative spirit. The majority of these are Central Committee members. Fundamentally, only people who had been invited spoke in a progressive spirit. This must not be forgotten.

[Reporter] Miners from Donetsk?

[Yeltsin] Well, this is it. Yes, and the party secretaries from Moscow University, the Volga car factory, and so on. Furthermore, they did not include, because the Central Committee is conservative, that this Central Committee is incapable of democratically preparing for and organizing the 28th Congress. What this means, as I proposed, is that the activity of the Central Committe must be suspended; an organizing committee must be chosen from the representatives of the base organizations of the country, and this organizing committee must make the preparations for the extraordinary 28th Party Congress. They there would be hope that this would really be a democratic congress. Apart from this, the direct election of delegates to the congress in the party base organizations—they did not make a decision on this, either.

[Reporter] In such a form, is there no hope that the 28th Congress will be democratic?

[Yeltsin] Yes, there is. I still think that after the debate in the draft platform, the base organizations, there will be serious changes. Secondly, the 28th Congress itself, I am sure, will successfully be brought up to a democratic level. Today, the leadership either was not able or did not want to bring it up to this level. Well, these are the six [as heard] points why I could not vote yes.

[Reporter] And what are you plans now, until the 28th Congress?

[Yeltsin] I will continue to strive to have these points included in the final platform of the party's 28th Congress.

[Reporter] what will happen if you are elected president of the Russian Republic, and the president of the Soviet Union is Gorbachev? Will there be single combat between you?

[Yeltsin] In such cases, as this is like reading tea leaves, I usually say: Do not ask provocative questions.

[Reporter] But this is what people are asking.

[Yeltsin] Well, this is what you should say to them. [passage omitted] Many people did not vote with me because they think differently. Perhaps they would even support me. But there is still some kind of fear, which does not permit them to raise their hands when the members of the Politburo are sitting there on the stage.

[Reporter] The illusion of unity?

[Yeltsin] The rusty nail of fear which they have hammered into people's hearts is still sticking out. [passage omitted]

Participant Gives Impression of Plenum

LD0902130390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 9 Feb 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with CPSU Central Committee plenum delegate Viktor Mikhailovich Lomin, by correspondent Lomakin on 9 February; place not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] [Lomakin] Our guest here is plenum participant Viktor Mikhailovich Lomin, a shaft sinker of the Zyryanetskaya mine in the Kuzbass. Viktor Mikhailovich, well, you were present at the plenum as an observer. What were your impressions of the plenum?

[Lomin] My first impression when I came there was that I thought that I had ended up in a home for the elderly—such age. And in my opinion, these people can decide absolutely nothing at all. No changes are expected in the near future until the whole apparatus is replaced completely. It was also decided at the plenum to hold reelections to party gorkoms, obkoms, and raykoms by May. Only then perhaps, will something change.

[Lomakin] I know, Viktor Mikhaylovich, that today you—well, your group of miners—were to meet with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. That meeting did not take place this morning, but as far as I know, it will take place this evening. What will you talk about with him?

[Lomin] The first and most important question will be of the status of the working committees. [passage omitted]

Commentator on Significance of CPSU Plenum

PM1202123790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Valeriy Vyzhutovich "Commentator's Notes" under the general rubric "Events, Facts, Opinions": "The Difficult Path of Renewal"]

[Text] On the eve of the opening of the CPSU Central Committee plenum, I wrote about the expectations linked with this extraordinarily important event in the life of the party and the country. The acute nature of the situation, the rivalry of various social forces, the polarization of opinions on leading the country out of the crisis—all this advised restraint in making predictions. It is now possible to say with utmost certainty: The plenum marked a turning point. The fundamental newness of the decisions adopted at the plenum calls for serious and profound analysis. It has been proposed to build mutual relations between the party and the law, between the party and society, between the CPSU leadership and rank and file communists in a completely new fashion. For the first time the party demonstrated its desire to prove its right to a leading role by means of practical policy rather than the statute book and revealed its readiness to fight for the position of the ruling party, but to do so strictly within the framework of the democratic process by defending its program in debate with other political forces.

The fact that the party is lagging behind the processes of perestroyka was admitted by virtually all the speakers. The lagging vanguard.... The whole acuteness and tension of the current situation is contained in this contradiction in terms. It is not a question of surrendering political responsibility for the fate of the country, of voluntarily giving up its social mission. Political vanguards exist in all states, and in all states they seek to strengthen rather than lose their influence.

It is true that apart from the CPSU there is no other political organization in our country which wields enough prestige and influence to assume the colossal burden of responsibility for the country and its future. However, people's fronts, democratic movements, and all kind of informal organizations do exist and are gaining weight in social terms. This is a political reality, and to ignore it would mean not only to demonstrate disrespect for other people's ideas and proposals, but also to provoke spontaneous outbursts of passions and to foster the mania for rallies of which we are just as tired as we once were of cowed unanimity.

In order to restore prestige and regain people's confidence we must not seek to rid ourselves of opponents but to compete with them by the power of our reasoning and arguments and the atttractiveness and realistic nature of the programs that are put forward. This is precisely the path which the party has chosen today. Loyalty to outdated methods is not just totally unconstructive, is also prevents the dismantling of ideological barriers and the hardened accretions of dogmas and prejudices. I am forced to emphasize this apparently obvious thought because charges of "departing from socialism" and foisting "alien" ideals and principles on people were repeatedly leveled at the center from the rostrum. I believe that the speaker was right who said that "the ideological and theoretical work of the party is attacked most often by people whom the new thinking has simply bypassed or those who refuse to accept it, just as they refuse to accept pluralism of opinions in society and the party."

Unexpectedly, a heated debate arose at the plenum around the question of whether the reports and elections in the party should be held before or after the congress. The final decision that the reports and elections will nonetheless take place before the congress inspires hope. It gives us faith that people who have lost their prestige and the confidence of the party masses and have demonstrated their obvious political bankruptcy will not be present at the congress.

The will of the party masses is increasingly becoming the decisive factor. However, it would be unforgivably thoughtless to perceive the cadre changes in Tyumen, Chernigov, Volgograd, or Sverdlovsk—for instance, as just routine organizational decisions in respect of specific individuals. The meaning of what is happening is much more fundamental than certain commentators would have us believe when they interpret the reform in the party as the replacement of a "bad" secretary with a "good" one. The plenum provided an example of another interpretation: The radical reform of the CPSU lies above all in the profound democratization of all party life. And in recognition of the right to different viewpoints expressed in platforms.

The adoption of the CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th Party Congress was not easy. A number of the measures to democratize mutual relations between the party and society and within the CPSU itself, which it contains, met with resistance from certain plenum participants. It appears that the debate was less than orderly at times. Nonetheless, the plenum participants firmly agreed that the viability of the party and its prestige and influence, which are being put to a serious test today, can and must be asserted in a completely new fashion—by practical policy and its real fruits.

The time has come for a radical reform of the CPSU. Let us look at life honestly: A profound democratic renewal does not occur automatically, nor will it be easy or smooth for either the party or the country. But there is no other way today. And everyone who wants progress along this path to be successful can contribute to this both by profound understanding and support for what is happening and by efforts aimed at accelerating the beneficial changes.

Journalists Discuss Plenum Proceedings, Results

LD1202153390

[Editorial Report] Moscow World Service in English at 0610 GMT on 12 February broadcasts the 20-minute "Inside Report" program, presented by Ivan Sedov, with journalists Dmitriy Volkov and Dmitriy Linnik.

They note that the discussion at the plenum produced the Central Committee platform to be discussed at the upcoming 28th CPSU Congress, which has been brought forward once again, to June or July. Some principle features of the platform are examined briefly, and highlights of the plenum are recalled. Speeches by the following are quoted briefly: Aleksandr Yakovlev, Ambassador to Poland Vladimir Brovikov, Deputy Foreign Minister Korolev, Vladislav Anufriyev, Yegor Ligachev, Dr. Svyatoslav Fedorov, and some guests at the plenum. The journalists note that despite the unprecedented division of views at the plenum, the platform still was endorsed with only one dissenting vote.

Right after the plenum, Linnik discussed the proceedings on the telephone with Dr. Leonid Dobrokhotov, an adviser at the Central Committee. Dobrokhotov says he believes that the CPSU is at the beginning of a real democratic revolution. Critics of Gorbachev have not developed a good alternative program. Gorbachev is aware of the changing situation in society; the events in some district Communist Party committees in Siberia, Russia, and so on, were good lessons.

Linnik, who was in Volgograd recently, describes the proceedings at the latest, 24 January, plenum of the local

Communist Party committee, which passed a vote of no confidence in Kalashnikov, who resigned. The turmoil persisted, however, as other leaders were revealed to have "stained their escutcheons, too." As a result, the entire 15-man buro of the regional committee stepped down. The local people still do not seem content, and the crisis continues. Linnik conducts a brief poll in the streets of Volgograd, showing that all is far from quiet there. A retired boiler operator says that what worries him is that the old guard keeps silent and sneers at talk of reform. A cashier says he thinks Kalashnikov should have stayed on to clean up the mess. Several other people are quoted, including a police sergeant, who thinks the Volgograd plenum was a breakthrough for democracy. What happened in Volgograd was typical of quite a few other important regions, such as Ufa and Tyumen.

The panel discusses the implications of the CPSU Central Committee plenum decisions. Volkov thinks the proposal to scrap or alter Article 6 is bound to exert influence going far beyond a merely political declaration. Power indeed is going to be handed over to the elected soviets, or councils of people's deputies. In addition, the political bodies in the Army and in industry will be altered significantly. Linnik says that the same goes for other political structures that will emerge with the introduction of a legalized multiparty system. Volkov notes that a multiparty system already exists: There are self-proclaimed parties that have not been officially registered yet, and one also can speak of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Volkov says political forces are divided along purely political and ethnic lines.

Linnik continues: "A split in the USSR Communist Party that I believe is already in evidence is going to be sealed by radical reformers that are to form their own structure, be it a faction or a party. On the other hand, those conservatives that could barely swallow the Central Committee platform are unlikely to split from the party leadership on their own, but I believe, I believe it's very important that the split should occur; it should be secured so that the party would preserve its influence and so that reforms would proceed more vigorously. I would speculate that this could be achieved through a split of the centrist, moderate, reformist majority from the conservative minority."

Volkov adds: "Such a split would, I believe, have another beneficial effect. It could be instrumental in stemming the nationalist coloring in some of the political movements in the national republics and wresting the potentially healthy forces away from nationalistic positions."

Linnik: "Overall, I believe any meaningful political force, such as an alternative party or parties, is bound to emerge from within the Communist Party of today, and that's widely recognized, but the Communist Party as such, I believe, is to remain the bulwark in the foreseeable future."

Volkov: "Obviously the kind of diversity that may be expected on the political scene, at least from the start, is not going to make for stability, which the nation seems to be badly in need of."

Linnik: "Well, I think the institution of presidency with strong executive powers is aimed exactly at balancing it out."

Volkov: "Another question that arises in relation to the proposed scrapping or altering of Article 6 of the Constitution and introducing a multiparty system is, isn't it too late?"

Linnik: "Well, again it's hopelessly belated according to the radicals, and it's simply impermissible, or at least too early, according to the conservatives. Whether either of them are right or wrong will be shown by how the political situation develops in the country in the months and years to come. What is clear now, though, is that if Gorbachev and his team went out of their way back at the start of perestroyka to persuade the people to take part in implementing that policy, now it's the people that are persuading the leadership—Gorbachev included—to be more active in pursuing the reforms, in seeing them through."

Plenum: Present Party 'Cannot Control Situation'

PM1202150990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 p 1

[Open letter from K. Fesenko, chairman of the "Artemugol" Production Association Labor Collective Council, V. Lomin, member of the Novokuznetsk Workers Committee, and G. Gorbylev, member of the Donbass Regional Council of Strike Committees Executive Committee: "What Miners Think About the Situation in Our Country"]

[Text] We must reveal the situation and clarify why perestroyka processes have slowed down and what worries us miners. Especially as there is a crisis situation in the country.

We know our government is poor and there is no money to solve cardinal, urgent problems, just as there are no radical proposals as to how to emerge from this situation either. The shadow economy's capital is incommensurate with the state budget deficit.

We are deeply convinced that perestroyka can be saved if you seek support among ordinary people. Then the bureaucracy-mafia stratum will be unable to withstand this dual pressure from above and below. And before the trust of the grassroots has been lost once and for all, a process of uniting the government and the people must be implemented.

Therefore today we need the truth more than ever before. In everything: What is feasible and within what timeframe, what privations must still be endured, which slogans are mistaken, which programs are utopian. For instance, it is time to replace the slogan "As we work, so we live" with the more comprehensible idea that no matter how hard you work, if you are badly led, only he who works lives badly, not the reverse. It is time at last to realize that the artificial shortage of information plays into the hands of the bureaucrat, who manipulates it in the struggle for power.

People have no faith in the bureaucratic stratum, so there is a need for a mechanism whereby the people themselves will decide whom among the apparatus to leave in power—elections of secretaries of raykoms [party rayon committees], gorkoms [party city committees], and obkoms [party oblast committees], right up to the Politburo, direct elections in an atmosphere of glasnost, like the elections of delegates to the party congress and people's deputies. There is no need to fear that people will make the wrong choice. They are capable of rectifying their errors; no people have ever been their own enemies.

The strike movement showed primarily the weakness of the government, which made plenty of promises, but cannot keep them all. But it also showed the real strength of people united by a common goal. We are fed up with demanding of the government what it cannot fulfill. We realize that our demands cannot be fulfilled without radical changes in domestic policy. In our view, we need considerable reductions in military spending—it is time to recognize that the army is by no means the reliable shield for the people that it is constantly made out to be. It would be more sensible to use the billions spent on the army in order to resolve domestic problems, which, incidentally, stem largely from the irresolution of the government itself and from its mistrust of ordinary citizens' constructive position. It is time to review international economic contracts. If after three days of shooting Romania can violate its pledges in order to feed its own people first of all and everyone recognizes the primordial justice of its revolution, why can our revolution not support itself at a critical moment.

We well remember Gorbachev's meeting with handpicked miners in Donetsk. What did this give Gorbachev except helpings of flattery served up supposedly in the name of the entire working class?

And if there is to be a frank discussion, let it be honest and direct, without strikebreaking. These meetings must show the mutual responsibility of the government and the people to the future generations from which we are taking not only raw material resources that do not belong to us but also the very possibility of life by transforming the country into a dump of exceedingly ecologically harmful technologies. This kind of attitude toward the environment and citizens' health can be displayed only by timeservers.

The recent CPSU Central Committee Plenum, in which some of us also took part, suggests the thought that the present Central Committee cannot control the situation in the country and the apparatus cannot pursue the center's policy and influence the situation at local level. It is increasingly difficult to keep the masses' energy within the bounds of the law. In our view, events may assume the most acute nature. In this situation, aware of our responsibility for the fate of the country, we see our task in the immediate future as being to strengthen the city workers committees, which are capable of channeling the workers movement in a creative direction....

We are convinced: Only the pooling of the efforts of the government and the partially awakened people will help to carry the necessary process of perestroyka through to final and irrevocable victory.

Readers Voice Support for Plenum Decisions

PM1202114990

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian in the 8 February 1990 Single Edition carries on page 1 under the general heading "The Country's Future—Our Future" a 1,000-word "Letters About the Party" feature comprising an editorial introduction and four readers' letters on the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The introduction reads:

"The fundamental questions of society's and the party's life which were submitted for discussion at the CPSU Central Committee plenum profoundly affect each Communist and each Soviet person who holds precious the ideals of the socialist society which is at the most crucial stage of revolutionary transformations.

"The editorial office is receiving telephone calls, telegrams, readers' letters, and reports from our correpondents in various okrugs. They express ardent support for the party's course of radical perestroyka along the paths of socialism's renewal and a desire to help it by word and deed and to interpret the realities of our complex time."

The four letters, each published under a different headline, express support for party policy and the plenum decisions.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Meets With Perestroyka Representatives

PM1202130190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Feb 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[Viktor Kozhemyako feature: "'On Behalf of Comrades, Communists....' Account of M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Representatives of the Key Links of Party Perestroyka"]

[Text] For long years we wrote and said that they are at the forefront of life. The gorkom [city party committee], the raykom [rayon party committee], the primary party organization.... Many people wanted to see them as something very near, something to which they could turn with all their concerns and needs, joys and anxieties. However, let us state frankly: These expectations were far from always justified. The party, which linked itself with the authoritarian-bureaucratic system, experienced the harsh influence of this system in all its links. This influence left its mark both on work methods and on relations among people.

The party's renewal has become a vital necessity, and a radical step toward it was taken by the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, which adopted the draft platform for the 28th party congress. Truly a landmark document! Concentrated in this document are thoughts on how to restructure the party so that it can act successfully with regard to the new realities taking shape in the country and so that it can fulfill its role of vanguard in the renewed society as a democratically recognized force.

It came into being on the basis of an active discussion which our readers know about from the speeches published in PRAVDA. It is characteristic that the plenum participants included not only Central Committee members but also a wide circle of guests. And the latter included a large group of party workers from the party's so-called lower links. The point is that they are lower only in terms of their established name but certainly not in terms of their significance. If we speak of asserting the power of the party masses as the fundamental idea of party perestroyka, they are, without exaggeration, of decisive, key significance today. We have to understand in a new way the role of the primary party organizations as regards admission to and withdrawal from the party, the use of membership dues, the realization of tasks connected with the party's new role as the political vanguard, and much besides. The role of the rayon and city link must be reinterpreted in a new way, and their rights must be substantially extended.

It was no coincidence that literally the day after the end of the plenum Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with the secretaries of primary party organizations and with the first secretaries of raykoms and gorkoms who had participated in its work. To have a heart-to-heart talk and to consult them. It was a meeting of party comrades, and it continued, as it were, the discussion begun at the plenum and highlighted more clearly some problems of the upcoming work, as well as ways to resolve them.

Great Concerns

So, 8 February, the hall at the CPSU Central Committee. What could be sensed at once in the atmosphere that had been established there? The special mutual trust and confidentiality. Somehow you cannot get your tongue around the official word "conference" to describe what happened. It is not appropriate in this case! Take the very beginning—Mikhail Sergeyevich at once put a question to the gathering:

"You've had enough of formal sessions, haven't you? It's a long time since we've had such sessions. And you've had enough of listening. What is your impression of the plenum? A useful discussion?"

"Useful...."

"Useful and difficult, not that it can be easy, because we cannot go on living like we used to, but we must live differently, and in order to live differently we must investigate how we lived and why that happened. The more deeply we delve into ourselves and into what is happening around us, the more we understand that there can be no simple solutions."

Yes, we have inherited a very difficult legacy, and the situation in society is very complex and tense. Everyone sees and feels this. Of course, the Central Committee general secretary's extremely frank and courageous assessment of the present situation is understood by his listeners.

But, naturally, it is not simply a question of stating the difficult actual situation. The most basic thing is: How to break it? Mikhail Sergeyevich has repeatedly said already that the policy of perestroyka was the result of great collective work by many people, of their questing, arguing, and thinking.

"Before I headed the Central Committee," M.S. Gorbachev now remarks, "my safe was literally crammed with suggestions from academicians and entire scientific collectives. People were shouting that it was necessary to change everything, from different angles: Some were for scientific and technical progress, others for transforming structural policy, yet others for new organizational forms in industry and in the countryside.... In short, from all angles there came a cry from the soul that things must no longer be managed in the old way. So it is nonsense to say that someone thought up perestroyka while sitting alone in his office."

We possess a mass of ideas and political decisions underpinned by a serious base of research and people's proposals. Our decisions do not integrate everything, and there is no synchronism in implementing them. This is a calamity. Big blunders have been made. But we have begun work which will determine what our society will be like for 10, 20, 30, or even 100 years to come. A very sharp turn! The difficulty for party organizations is that they must keep all this in their field of vision and remember why and for what purpose we have undertaken all this. On the other hand, the entire specific nature of life today and all social tension hangs like a sword of Damocles. It grabs right at your throat, as Mikhail Sergeyevich put it. And sometimes, despite the strategic approaches and decisions, you have to act using the old methods here, as was also heard at the Central Committee plenum.

The transitional period.... Is it not being dragged out? Will it not morally exhaust the strength of the people and the party and undermine people's faith? Opinions seem to be unanimous: The transitional period must be compressed as far as possible.

M.S. Gorbachev: I believe that we are climbing out and will climb out, comrades. Many mechanisms have already been engaged. We only need to ensure that the boat is not rocked and we are not sent off course. This is very important. And everyone must row.... But I will say that it will still be difficult like this. We are now carrying out perestroyka in a very difficult society. A very difficult society. It has built up in such a way that it is not so easy to turn it around. This is why I said at the plenum yeaterday: Comrades, maintain your height of vision. If you approach in despair and get into a panic, it is altogether possible to decide—turn back or dry the oars and turn off the engine. But if you look at what we have undertaken, taking into account what this will mean for the country and the whole world, then all these difficulties of ours will seem temporary. But we must not, of course, disregard them and float somewhere up in the air—we must unite the perspective and the movement along our set course. Because, unless things start to be rectified in the very near future, fatigue will follow. It is also dangerous if the processes in society assume a more destructive nature.

The surmounting of the difficulties facing us today will largely depend on how successfully the perestroyka of the work of party organizations—the primary ones above all—proceeds. The draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th congress provides a good basis for this.

V.V. Roslyakov, party committee secretary of the "Severnoye mashinostroitelnoye predpriyatiye" Production Association from Arkhangelsk: I propose launching a debate around the draft platform on Central Television, involving Politburo members and Central Committee secretaries. At a definite time and, maybe, on a definite channel. It would be good for this debate to open with a statement from the general secretary.

M.S. Gorbachev: Nenashev, chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, has already approached me and said: Can we schedule a detailed conversation so that I can interrogate you. I said: Let's get the plenum behind us. But we must certainly do this. Let this conversation take place. We could even invite Muscovite secretaries, so that the general secretary is accompanied by secretaries from primary organizations. That would make things more trenchant and more useful.

Voice: The most prestigious communists, everyone who enjoys respect and trust within the party, must be invited to these televised debates. To ensure that people are glued to their television sets, waiting for this debate....

The meeting's participants recalled the past fate of the CPSU platform on the nationalities question. It was adopted—whereupon many people forgot it virtually immediately. Party organizations did not really take it on board. This must not be repeated with the new important document.

They also recalled how a well-known writer had delivered an account of last year's December Central Committee plenum—and not in a party organ moreover. Yet no Central Committee secretaries thought it possible to share their thoughts and impressions, thus depriving millions of Soviet people of information so keenly awaited. Hence the scope for idle conjecture.

"The Politburo is slow off the mark with its political assessments within the country. Anyway, why can Daniil Granin comment on the situation within the Politburo, while Politburo members themselves cannot?"

M.S. Gorbachev: I believe that henceforth we must act like that. We had a discussion late yesterday evening. We reached the general conclusion that for the period of such serious events as, for instance, the recent plenum or the upcoming party congress there must be a special group responsible for promptly perceiving the public mood and determining the questions on which people want and must have objective information. This group would then direct who is to take the floor, where they are to speak, and to whom. In some cases at the level of leading apparatus officials, in others at the level of Politburo member or the general secretary.

N.P. Gritsenko, first secretary of Krasnodar CPSU Gorkom: In overall terms the CPSU Central Committee platform is a powerful new political topic. If, literally as of today, the party—from the Politburo down to every party activist at local level—does not take this topic in hand, if it is handed over to the opponents of the party, we will squander the opportunities opening up before us.

M.S. Gorbachev: I agree!

N.P. Gritsenko: This is the kind of powerful weapon in terms of its potential and innovative spirit that we must confidently take to the congress. We must hold the initiative. It is simply a pity, Mikhail Sergeyevich, if we let it slip through our hands there.

Under New Conditions

We can no longer work as we did yesterday. The conditions in which the party is operating have changed drastically and are continuing to change. Some party officials acknowledge that the ground is slipping from under their feet. It was simple before: An order was given—and that was all. Things are different now.

Take political pluralism in society. A host of informal politicized associations frequently exist alongside a party committee, and the emergence of other parties is not precluded now. All this requires every CPSU member and, even more so, every party official to have the ability to constantly and attentively keep his finger on the pulse of life, master the art of debate, uphold his viewpoint—in short, to wage a political struggle.

"Why do we not listen to many of our comrades," S.M. Gerasimchuk, secretary of "Mosmetrostroy" party committee, raised the question. "Why don't they dominate at rallies, and sometimes don't even command an audience within their own collectives? The main reason is lack of practical experience of political struggle."

The party committee secretary described how he had recently visited Italy and inquired how communists fought for the post of mayor of Rome. He derived a great deal of instructive information. For instance, Italian communists use political marketing services—this concept does exist. Many of us have not even heard of it.

Secretaries of workshop party organizations have begun to meet regularly for some time now, once a week, under the "Mosmetrostroy" party committee. First, five people, then 12, and now up to 80. Their main aim is to exchange opinions and experience. The party gorkom has accommodated them: A lecture hall has been allocated at the House of Political Enlightenment where a council of this kind is held every Friday. Cooperation with "Democratic Platform" has taken shape there. It may be said to be businesslike and a source of debate [diskussionnyy].

M.S. Gorbachev: That is interesting.

A.V. Maslov, first secretary of Novosibirsk CPSU Gorkom: We are also trying to cooperate with representatives of party clubs. The draft congress platform will, I believe, give us even more opportunities to do this.

Second question. Failing to give the future proper thought, we have thoroughly neglected to train party cadres. The present structure of higher party schools and their teachers—who are frequently failed [nesostoyavshiysya] party officials—makes an impact here. But the main thing is that we begin to look for the talents of mathematicians, physicists, and chemists at children's physics and math schools, after the eighth grade. But why don't we realize earlier the need to train political specialists also?

Let us take a look. Maybe there shouldn't be a higher party school, but an institute for the social problems of management? Maybe people should not be trained from the age of 30, as is the case now, but earlier, from institute age. After all, we must count on young people.

And seek new approaches in this connection. So we have set up a managers school under the party gorkom. Even guys from the higher party school have hurried off there. To learn new, contemporary work methods. Although we are lucky in that we do have a base—a good Akademgorodok, institutes, and cadres. All the best teachers have been drawn there. They have assembled and begun to train youngsters there. We believe that this is a very promising business.

When party officials meet the question of the correlation between "purely" party and economic functions always arises very vehemently within the discussion. The party is now renouncing direct interference in economic affairs. But you cannot straightway, easily, and simply cast people's urgent everyday needs to the wind without having created the requisite conditions for real power for the soviets.

"We are now as it were hostages to the people on some questions, particularly strictly economic questions"—this is how V.G. Golovachev, first secretary of Saratov CPSU Gorkom, formulated this acutest of problems.

"To be specific," he continued, "this involves above all the critical state of the heat supply and the introduction of a heating system in the city. The people don't see anyone when accidents or things of that ilk occur, they primarily see the party organs. This has also had an impact this winter. I spoke to an elderly woman, a pensioner, at a difficult time. She said: I am speaking to you, the first secretary, and I believe you. I am pleased that we have met. But do you know what's bad for you? First, these municipal issues with which we associate you above all. Second, all incidents like the Far East cruise involving the automobiles [reference to party officials' purchase of foreign cars while on cruises out of Soviet Far East ports] or the events in Chernigov and Volgograd, which have been mentioned in the press and which inflict serious damage on party officials' prestige. Although I perfectly understand, she added, that by no means everyone in the party is like that. There are in the party far more people whom the people sincerely respect. Let there be still more of them!"

A party official's duties—both professional and moral—are extremely wide ranging. On the other hand, he also needs some social protection. Is that not why the question of elaborating the status of secretary and party committee member—from primary party organization to Central Committee—was also raised at the meeting? The time demands it.

Many proposals related to the work of the Central Committee. For instance, it is proposed that, as under Lenin, Central Committee plenums regularly examine the question of the current moment. It is proposed that all-union party conferences be held annually. It is proposed that the practice of holding all-union scientific and practical conferences on problems of party work and the exchange of experience be restored.

However, undertones of dependence nonetheless also crept in among the practical opinions. One speaker, for instance, said the following: The Central Committee rarely sends out guidelines on current policy, they were a great help in the old days. Well, times have indeed changed and become much more dynamic and fuller. Are the "guidelines" keeping pace with them? Why must everything be presented to party officials at local level in a predigested form which requires no analysis? Maybe those people who think for themselves, who analyze up-to-the-minute press and television materials, and who go to people with their own ideas, rather than with a ready-made scrap of paper from above, and generate feedback are more correct....

Whom To Elect, and How?

There were two aspects to the discussion of elections at the meeting. First, deputies are now being elected to republic and local soviets. Second, there is to be a report and election campaign in the party and elections of delegates to the 28th congress. There are many problems in both cases.

Here is the opinion of V.V. Borodayev, first secretary of Krasnyy Sulin Gorkom, Rostov Oblast, with regard to the first question. He believes that work must be conducted locally now so that the soviets and their presidiums are headed by gorkom and raykom first secretaries.

"Yes, your idea, which was aired in the past, Mikhail Sergeyevich, was very right. It is also connected with the presidency idea, which we support. I cannot see any other way out in the situation today, so that the party also has an opportunity to influence the resolution of specific questions."

M.S. Gorbachev: I am convinced even now that the line is correct in principle. We preferred to make it somewhat more flexible with regard to the particular situation prevailing. No good will come of it unless we notify people from top to bottom of the mechanisms for executing and realizing policy. And the chain really does go from the presidency to here, to the specific soviet. We are still novices in these matters.

K.K. Baykenov, first secretary of Alma-Ata Gorkom of the Kazakh Communist Party: Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have already been elected chairman of the city soviet and I am chairman of the presidium of our city soviet....

M.S. Gorbachev: Yes? That's splendid! And how do you feel?

K.K. Baykenov: We held elections in the middle of January, but they were very complex. Very many questions were asked, and there were opponents—both individual ones and, let us say so frankly, those who do not stand on the CPSU platform: They actively torpedoed the combining of posts. We had to do a good deal of work. Before the session we assembled the party group of deputies, and there was also a very long and thorough discussion—for even among our communists there were people who doubted the need to combine posts. Well, we tried to explain and convince them that this way works to strengthen the party's authority in resolving economic questions.

M.S. Gorbachev: This is a very real and strong mechanism for linking the party with the new soviets. This combining of posts stems, in fact, even from world practice. Parties struggle, and they struggle there at municipal level too, at any level. If a certain party or block has won, then the leader also heads the municipal organ.... [Gorbachev ends]

Heated arguments flared up at the meeting over the report and election campaign in party organizations and the elections of delegates to the 28th party congress. The plenum has already decided the main point: To hold a robust report and election campaign—before the congress moreover. But again there were questions, questions, and doubts. Once again Mikhail Sergeyevich patiently explained: We must crystallize out new forces. If the Central Committee is formed in the present situation, then a situation similar to the present one will again arise there in six months' time.

Voice: And the structure? Does the vertical structure remain the same: oblast committee, kray committee, raykom?

M.S. Gorbachev: We are convinced of this at present. There is no need to break it. We on the Central Committee have given it a great deal of thought and consulted each other.

Voice: There is still too little though.

M.S. Gorbachev: These are revolutionary times—we have to live by these yardsticks. Therefore I ask for your support.

Voices: The correct decision!

M.S. Gorbachev: About the election procedure. You have been shown three versions. Several ideas have clashed. In principle, I would say the chief idea is this: To record in the platform that the delegates' elections must be direct, secret, and multiple-candidate. Either by party okrug, or, staying loyal to the present Statutes, we act like this. Primary organizations nominate, and conferences discuss and take in all these recommendations, draw up a list and add to it maybe. The entire list goes to the vote in primary organizations. That is, it turns out that, having begun with the primary organization, caught its opinion, and discussed it at a conference, we return again to the primary organization: Let it decide. Is this an option? It is. There might be an okrug with one, two, or more candidates. Or maybe everything should even be left altogether to the discretion of the local level.... [Gorbachev ends]

Different views, different versions clashed. Different arguments. This viewpoint made itself known very resolutely: Taking account of the high assessment of the role of raykoms, it is they that should be entrusted with forming the okrugs.

However, without going here into the details of all the versions and motives given, I would like to draw your attention to one idea. About the so-called "wedding generals," i.e. representatives of the center who are elected in the provinces. I.N. Medvedev, first secretary of Khokholskiy Raykom, Voronezh Oblast, said that one-fourth of their delegation to the 19th party conference was made up of leading nomenklatura workers from Moscow, many of whom were quite unknown to the oblast's communists. Is this good? Is it right? Take the composer Pakhmutova, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic deputy from the oblast. She is known there, she visits the rayons and meets with voters. Why not recommend her and people like her as candidates for the congress?

Well, this is a logical idea, the meeting participants agreed.

In almost any serious discussion among party workers now the talk turns to the press. At this meeting too now one speaker, now another shared his concern at the present state of relations between party committees and the mass media, which certainly cannot be called conflict-free and cloudless. There are indeed many questions. It is good that an increasing desire to resolve them and not just to note them is being manifested. At the same time the still dominant—accusatory—approach is gradually giving way to an analytical one.

The conference participants agreed—and this position was actively supported by M.S. Gorbachev—that under conditions of political pluralism the stake must be made not on banning but on keeping ahead. A party assessment must keep ahead of incompetent or unobjective commentary.

"Privileges" Once Again

Angry condemnations of party officials' "benefits" are heard everywhere! For some time now it has been the piece de resistance of many rally orators and platform wits, a sure way of gaining a rapid and easy reputation as an uncompromising fighter for justice.

Let us be frank: What happened, happened. Albeit not in the grotesque forms often given out and represented by public rumor. But a great deal is changing fast. Recently MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI reported how their correspondent was disappointed by the Central Committee refreshment room, about which he had previously heard legends. Increasingly it is not the accusers of the "party hierarchy" but the party officials themselves who demand frank and open discussion of the topic of the party and privileges. The meeting which we are describing was no exception.

"There has been talk of social protection here," V.M. Platonov, secretary of the "Chelyabinskiy Traktornyy Zavod" Production Association party committee, said to the general secretary. "Are we not overdoing things regarding party officials? It is said that we are clinging on to our jobs. What retains us, to be honest, is the awareness that at this difficult time for the party it is necessary to fight for the party. For example—everyone of us could now leave. In any case, it is not what is imputed to us that keeps us here. And the people who foist the problem of privileges upon party officials quite often themselves possess that which would get an obkom secretary 'kicked out' tomorrow...."

M.S. Gorbachev: Well, what privileges does a party organization secretary's post afford him? The privilege of rushing around day and night? I, after all, know from my own experience how difficult it was to work as a secretary in previous times. Then it was difficult to find a sensible secretary. I am sure that all of what you say is very true and should be no secret to anyone.

What, comrades, is todays' party apparatus? It should in its own way be a unique mechanism in terms of its potential and universality. Let us try to find more such people who are capable of handling the new functions being dictated by perestroyka! And how much needs to be combined in a single person from the standpoint of requirements, education, culture, morality, and democracy. No, one must in no circumstances trample upon people.

V.M. Platonov: Social protection is absolutely necessary, or else we will lose capable candidates. Then it will not only be a problem finding the secretary of a primary organization. I am sure that people will not go into obkoms and gorkoms either. The vacuum will be filled by dull, weak cadres.

The discussion has obviously touched on the most sensitive topics. This is clear from the buzz in the hall and the retorts indicative of the offense felt.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich, whom does the shadow economy hit? The army, the KGB, and party officials...."

Voices are heard from everywhere: That's right, that's right.

"But for some reason the trade union is not affected. There the wages have gone up since September to the level of party committee secretaries plus 70 percent of deductions from trade union dues....

"We are told today: Give back to the people the 20 billion spent on increasing your wages. That was the slogan during the Sunday rally in downtown Moscow. Give the figures for the increase given to party officials."

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrade Kruchina, administrator of affairs in the Central Committee, is here in the hall. Nikolay Yefimovich, do you have the figures?

N.Ye. Kruchina: The party wage increase came to R350 million. But 96 percent of the wage increase for Central Committee apparatus workers was obtained through cutting its staff, that is to say, through wages fund savings. In the obkoms and kraykoms 80 percent of the wage rise was secured through cuts in the apparatus. Only in raykoms has the wages fund risen substantially....

M.S. Gorbachev: Because we have made virtually no staff cuts in raykoms. They need to be bolstered there. And that is where extra payment has been made. But in all other party committees in effect only that saved through staffing cuts was allocated for the pay raise. [Gorbachev ends]

It is doubtless unnecessary to add that the wages have been increased for an apparatus which has been substantially renewed and which contains specialists with the highest qualifications. Just among CPSU Central Committee apparatus officials there are now 71 doctors of science and 343 candidates of science—one in three. If you bear in mind that they work late hours, often without days off, then the increase will not really seem inordinate, particularly compared with the wages of their colleagues "settled down" in scientific institutions with a far more merciful work regime and with the free time that is so valuable today.

Meanwhile, the exchange of opinions continues on this problem of concern to us all.

V.I. Zhurina, secretary of the party committee of the Orekhovskiy cotton combine from Moscow Oblast, described how some contenders for deputies' seats are exploiting this fashionable topic:

"Just before I came here, to the plenum, we were approached by the election agent of a well-known journalist—he is one of ours, from Moscow Oblast. A discussion ensued, and I asked why this journalist had started raising the question of party officials' wages so tendentiously on the eve of the elections? Let us compare his wages with ours. Let us converse with him in public and I will tell him in our 1,000-seat Palace of Culture my opinion...."

Of course, market considerations are far from being the main reason for the upsurge in leveling sentiments. They do have deeper roots, Mikhail Sergeyevich said. Social protection turns into its own opposite and becomes pernicious if it inculcates laziness and parasitism and robs people of incentives and initiative. Its inevitable result is satisfaction with the minimum, which reduces to the lowest level not just the standard of living but also the standard of work.

The champions of wage leveling seek support among those who look around them with jealousy and envy and desire a universal leveling. They have established their base among people with a lumpen mentality whose banner reads "I have nothing, so let no one have anything! I do not have enough—so let everyone have equally little!"

"This stratum," Mikhail Sergeyevich said, developing his ideas on the roots of leveling tendencies, "is pretty sizable in our society. Its weaknesses and even vices are exploited by both right and left. This stratum expects simple slogans and has a weakness for them, particularly those which match its cherished wish to iron everything flat and redistribute all the proceeds in the spirit of primitive communism. In KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA an 'erudite' lady proposed creating identical starting conditions for the people and to level incomes for this purpose. Returning to the previous state again! In the summer, during my vacation, I took with me the proceedings of the first congresses and conferences held under Lenin. I read them carefully and tried to sense and understand the atmosphere in which the processes of that time developed. The struggle was a hard one. And I found Bukharin there saying: We, comrades, have already implemented distributive communism, everything has been expropriated and consumed and there is nothing more to divide up. We must work, productive communism is needed. I thought to myself: Something similar is taking place now too, no way will we move on.

"Therefore when some people become indignant, we say in response—the decision on party officials' wages was a fair one. I have already said this and will defend this position in any auditorium. Party officials now bear an enormous burden of responsibility. The upcoming party elections will help make our cadre corps even more creative and answerable to the strictest demands of the times and the requirements of perestroyka.

Enough Work for Everyone

Very different people were gathered at the Central Committee on this occasion—representatives of party organizations from many sectors of industry and agriculture, science and culture, and emissaries from dissimilar regions. But they all had the same chief concern: The renewal and strengthening of the party. Everyone wanted both to share his own experience and to raise an acute problem. This was not only for themselves—it was, as one secretary said, "in the name of comrades, communists."

"We have brought the mood of the masses," he remarked.

"We stand face to face with communists every day, and so we know what they live for and what they think about," another said.

The desire for more meeting participants to speak led to people speaking not from the rostrum but directly from their seats, and briefly—they themselves set rigid rules. It was possible to listen to 17 people.

M.S. Gorbachev: I am very pleased with the meeting. With the fact that you show such great concern for the party. You have said much that is useful and important, and we must bear all this in mind. In the process of renewal things must proceed in such a way that the efficiency of all party activity is not weakened but strengthened. We will definitely endeavor to take into account the many thoughts expressed here, to take them into account when finalizing the congress platform.

Second. I believe that everything that was said about how to organize work on the platform and, generally, how to conduct precongress affairs is very important. We must probably discuss this specially in the Politburo, determine the plan, and mobilize everything: The party, the mass media, scientists—everyone. In order, as someone said here, to really reveal every thesis of the platform and show its significance.

As we have decided, we will still undertake a robust report and election campaign, and on the eve of the congress. I wish you success in this struggle. I believe that we can do a great deal in connection with the adopted document in order to enrich the party now through a new understanding of its role and place as the political vanguard of society.

I understand your feelings. Not everything is clear to many people. How to act both in the sphere of cadres and in the sphere of ideology.... I realize this. But in general we have not yet completed everything. We are on the move. I believe that we will make thorough progress on the basis of the draft platform for the congress. This will help us. Let nothing trouble you. I can see that people who are consciously devoted to the party cause have gathered here. You do not have panic sentiments, which is very good.

Of course, we have to answer for everything, since we are the ruling party. The party's functions have been such that we have to answer precisely for everything. But nevertheless the people do not, I believe, feel that the whole party to a man is to blame. For all that, the bulk of party members have at all stages devoted their strength and knowledge to the people and done their thing honestly. So there cannot be any nihilism here. We must speak about what happened to the party as a result of the deformations that occurred in the course of realizing the socialist idea and that turned the party into the instrument of this deformed idea and of other distorted notions. This is where the problem lies.

We have already said this. We have felt this hard, and we are coming out of it. It has to be said that only a strong party is capable of this. It alone can stand this test. When the party collapses, the entire structure of society, the state and public institutions also collapse. Thus, in this sense the party is the programmatic political and ideological framework of our society and the base for its confident renewal.

The party is the key today. Much depends on how our primary and rayon organizations work. For everything is here! Everything will be decided here, comrades! The primary organization and the rayon—this is the chief thing. And the center, which would give correct guidelines for the whole party.

The congress really had to be brought nearer. But we must also resolve urgent questions in order to reduce socioeconomic tension. If the party acts differently—together with the people, relying on them—by developing its basic links, primary and rayon, and resolving these urgent questions affecting people's daily lives, this can at once change the situation. It is very important to us that the credit of confidence does not disappear. That fatigue does not follow. Therefore it is necessary to act by resolving—through reform—socioeconomic problems and strengthening the mechanism of execution. There is enough work for everyone here—for the Supreme Soviet, the government, and you.

It is necessary to resolve more quickly the question of the Law on Local Soviets, to hold elections, and, before them, to give the soviets rights so that people on the spot feel this. Because few positive changes are yet occurring at the lower level. Party organs have begun moving away from specifics and do not now have sectoral departments, while the soviets have not yet really taken off.

Different methods, including even direct commands, will coexist during the transitional period. If today management mechanisms have not yet taken shape which must resolve questions affecting people's daily life, can a raykom secretary really say: This is not our affair! No, that is nonsense. Let the party secretary assemble all cadres—communists and nonparty people, too—and ask: "Comrades, what do you think? Here is the fate of the people, here is their work, their life. Can we remain aloof?" No one will walk away. Communists do not walk away from such ills. Only you do not have to be direct economic work superintendents, as it were. But unite people, organize them, and pose the problem—here, in my opinion, you must not hold back. You must take it on.

Party work is not art for art's sake. I am only against it when a party secretary turns into the director of a rayon or an enterprise. This is no longer the same thing. Then he will certainly overlook things, as he used to overlook a great deal. It is dangerous not to notice maturing problems and sentiments in time and not to influence them—for at this time destructive forces will be operating, pressuring people's opinions and turning them in quite the wrong direction. If this is missed, then nothing will save the situation any more. This is the dialectical situation, and in it it is necessary to act just as dialectically.

As for seminars and practical and theoretical conferences—in short, the exchange of experience spoken of here—this can, I believe, be realized even now, M.S. Gorbachev continued. But at local level. We will not now succeed in conducting a measure on an all-union scale: Everything is already choked. There is no point in holding it just for the sake of it. Work and discussion around the congress platform will today be the chief form of universal study. It is here that it is necessary to find good forms and make better use of all possibilities.

This meeting confirms that we must meet regularly. I am pleased and I wish you great successes, Mikhail Sergeyevich said in conclusion.

But were the other participants pleased with the discussion that took place? A few quick interviews.

"I liked the frankness. No one felt constrained, and I personally received answers to my chief questions."

"The atmosphre of the February plenum, the guidelines of the congress platform, this democratization of our party life—all this gives a good charge. There are many complex and even very complex problems. But they can be resolved."

"Our new role at a new stage in the life of society still has to be realized in depth. But the plenum and today's conversation help us to realize this and to tackle real perestroyka in the party."

...They still did not let Mikhail Sergeyevich go for a long time, bombarding him with questions. Many questions were also put to N.N. Slyunkov, G.P. Razumovskiy, and Yu.A. Manayenkov, who also participated in the meeting.

Many secretaries hurried straight from there, from the Central Committee hall, to catch a train or a plane: Meetings devoted to the plenum have already been scheduled in labor collectives and party organizations. Great, strenuous work is beginning in connection with the party's radical renewal in a society which is being renewed, and in connection with the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

Further on Gorbachev Meeting With Lithuanian Aktiv

90UN0837A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 16 Jan 90 pp 2-5

[Unattributed report on Gorbachev meeting with Lithuanian Communist Party activists; place and date not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] **B.I. Oleynik, secretary of the Ukrainian Writers Union Board and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities:**

I was simply happy to once again see for myself what I already knew: The very biorhythm, national institutions, and genotype of the Lithuanian contain the code of fascination with friendship. Such has been the historical destiny of Lithuania that it has always been tolerant of other peoples and has brought them together, and we have been on such friendly terms. There's no denying that all along the way, wherever we have come together, I have not felt myself to be a stranger, I have felt at home. We quickly came to agree with the writers, they said, let us accept the following formula: Both Gorbachev and we are right. This is altogether more cheerful, and we can, consequently, reach agreement. What do I wish to say? I understand that man is natural a la Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and, consequently, his demand that his national dignity be respected lest he be lost in the multifaceted and diverse world and that he have his own national traits is natural also. This natural aspiration is comprehensible both in the Ukraine and throughout the world. Comrade Brazauskas says that Gorbachev is the man with whom we link our hopes for perestroyka and such. So help this man.

I believe that in one speech I scared the audience somewhat, saying: But what if Gorbachev takes a more leftward turn than your separate Lithuanian Communist Party? How would we look then? I know that by virtue of party ethics Mikhail Sergeyevich cannot, say, disclose now the documents that are being prepared for the 28th congress, but in all practical actions, which are occurring before the eyes of the whole enlightened world, it can be seen that a fundamental renewal of the party is under way. Obviously, there are many aspects therein which are being suggested by the Lithuanian communists and which will be taken into consideration and which already have been taken into consideration. But think about us also. One comrade said: What do you think, that we are deaf and are listening only to ourselves? But some regions of the country are reading precisely that you sometimes do not think about us. Let us, for all that, effect perestroyka together. I wish to thank you once again for having been so benevolent toward others and to say, the truth never becomes banal from repetition, that in this beautiful and fierce world, where market conditions change and where even the value of foreign currency declines, there is one sole currency—the gold of friendship. We are forgetting this, but should be remembering it always. [passage omitted]

I. Minkyavichyus, corresponding member of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences:

(The speaker began his speech in Lithuanian; then continued it in Russian)

So I began my speech in our official language in order to say that its establishment as the official language does not in the least mean that the Lithuanian people do not know Russian or will not speak it. The Lithuanian people are sufficiently civilized as to know this language and speak it. I wish to say also that determination of the status of independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party does not in the least mean that it will sever its relations with and ties to others, primarily the CPSU. But how much misunderstanding, what a shuffling of concepts and how much prejudice there are on this issue!

Lithuania has been saying for three days now: Esteemed Mikhail Gorbachev, you have become even more esteemed because you, as the world's leading politician, have come to see us and meet with our Independent Communist Party. It is, after all, very pleasant for you to socialize with people, with your partners in the world, who are independent. And, of course, with our first person in the republic, with our esteemed Algirdas Brazauskas, who always speaks so well of you.

What is the heart of the matter? Moving toward our 20th congress, we reiterated: Independence is our substance. Can a political party perform its functions unless it is independent?

This is our platform, this is our priority. All the rest is derivative. Proceeding from this, we are building our relations with others and, of course, would like these relations to be the most propitious. It is incomprehensible to me and, most likely, to many people, particularly those who are outside of this hall, how we can be put on a par with those who have broken away (this was the speaker's name for Lithuania's communists adhering to the CPSU platform—Editor). This has always suffered bankruptcy. I am speaking about the subject, the essence of the matter, and not against anyone.

We know and have known for many years, have known for decades and, to put it mildly, the presence here, for example, of Mikolas Burokyavichyus—what a ridiculous situation.... (noise in the hall).

M.S. Gorbachev: What arrogance!

I. Minkyavichyus: We know, we know this full well....

A model should, perhaps, be formulated—one of contradictions in the USSR. What kind of model is this? It is emphasized very often that the contradictions with us are interethnic. Is this the case? I believe it is not. If they are in fact surfacing in places, abruptly and tragically, it is not to be concluded from this fact that there are contradictions between all peoples. On the one hand, their interests, on the other, the system of the unitary state. It is from this that we need to proceed. If this cause and effect relationship is not taken into consideration, nothing much will come of perestroyka.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, I admit that I have blundered. But the point is that in a bookstore in Stockholm I recently came across the book "From Socrates to Gorbachev". The blunder lies in me not being able to present you with this book at this time, but I would like to emphasize that the wisdom that emanates therefrom, from that far-off civilization, from that classical intellect, it should be continued also in the part of the plenum in which you will surely present from this entire kaleidoscope the essence, by no means to please the conservative part of the plenum. We would very much like to see that body increasingly replaced by progressive people.

You have set us here domestic chores. Permit me to give you a domestic assignment also. It is as follows: "Great Rus united forever an indestructible alliance of free republics...." Please take a look at each word and the entire syntactical meaning of this construction. You are constantly saying that imperial thinking is organically alien and foreign to you. Please, we beg you to examine this formula. This is, after all, the national anthem.

Esteemed Ivan Timofeyevich, the speaker then addressed I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA. You gave readers for New Year's a bill of exchange. Please redeem this bill constantly. Write about us as we are.

Z. Baltsevich, editor of the newspaper CZERWONY SZTANDAR:

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, comrades!

I would like at the start of my speech to read out a letter from a Russian individual, a communist from Novosibirsk, Vitaliy Mikhaylovich Mitin, to the editorial offices of the sole Polish newspaper in the Soviet Union, published in Lithuania. Although he entitled his letter "Appeal to the Communists of Lithuania," it is in fact an appeal to the communists of the Soviet Union. Many of the ideas which it propounds merit wider attention. This is what he writes:

"Dear CZERWONY SZTANDAR editors, I request that you publish my appeal. The point is that all our problems come from the fact that the nations are unequal. Were the Lithuanians equal to the Russians, they would endeavor to ensure that the Poles were equal with Lithuanians and Russians. But now the Russians govern Lithuanians, and the Lithuanians aspire to govern Poles and Russians in Lithuania. The Lithuanians are merely making a retaliatory move. I, a Russian, am telling you this. We need to make everyone equal. An appeal to Lithuania's communists might help here."

"Comrades!

"As a communist-internationalist, I warmly welcome the decision of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress, the reason you are communists is that you may be free. We ourselves, we Russian communists, pushed you into the Lithuanian Communist Party's withdrawal from the CPSU. This is the direct result of the CPSU's disastrous nationality policy.

"The Lithuanians had two versions of being equal with the Russians. The first was running the country and the CPSU on an equal basis with the Russians. The second was withdrawing either from the USSR or the CPSU.

"The first version was blocked by we Russians. Lithuanians were not let near administration of the whole country. The USSR Government consists in practice only of Russians, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, also. So Lithuanians were left only with the second version. This version, incidentally, has already been prepared for the other 13 republics and parties. Nor are they being admitted to the management of all-union affairs. They also are being fobbed off with a handout in the form of a certain independence, but only in local affairs, no more. The whole center belongs entirely only to us Russians. But in what way are we better than others? I also am opposed to the party's federative arrangement, but, however, I am for the party's international leadership. The leaders of our party, however, are not permitting this either. This is blindness, and without an international Politburo we cannot make it, try as we might. Federal administration of the country should also be exercised by an international government of representatives of all the 15 union republics, and not from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] alone. Anything else will lead to the distintegration of the party and the country, and we Russians, and not the Lithuanians, will be responsible for this. Vitaliy Mikhaylovich Mitin, member of the CPSU, a Russian, higher education, born 1949 and I work in Novosibirsk's 'Zapsibzolotostroy' Mobile Mechanized Column.

"P.S. Dear Editors, you should help the Lithuanians, and you would be greatly helping the Russian center to come to its senses. I am ashamed for my people that our representatives have taken over the whole center. Two Russians have again been elected chairman and deputy chairman of the Constitutional Oversight Committee, but one, for example, should have been a Lett, the other, an Uzbek." End of letter.

Undoubtedly, I do not believe that it would be right to accuse the Russian people or Russians generally of all the troubles. However, this letter testifies that for the adoption of the correct decision on the question of the future status of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the future of the CPSU and the USSR as a whole serious all-party counsel is needed, and urgently. Forgive me, Mikhail Sergeyevich, but I believe that it will be somewhat difficult for the current CPSU Central Committee plenum to grasp all these problems and make the correct decision. I propose that this matter be examined at the 28th CPSU Congress, and without delay, preferably in the month of April.

A few more thoughts of my own. I would compare the Soviet Union with a large family in which the father—the party apparatus of all levels, and not the CPSU—has continuously ruled in authoritarian manner. And in which the mother—Soviet power—has merely given birth to us and has had no voice in this so-called common home and is only now timidly attempting to play her part, but with immense difficulty. Since even though the father said to her: Be the housewife, mother, he simply cannot leave off his habits. The children, the eldest son, and the other children, somewhat older and more adult, and also the young ones. Each has his place, as they say.

What has happened now? Why have these young ones begun to so disturb both the older children and the head of the family and why does the mother's heart ache? The point is that we have all become adults. Having become aware of our human dignity, we wish to be independent and self-sufficient. Is this good or bad? I believe it is a natural desire when people want to work for themselves and keep themselves and to live better, not in accordance with wage-leveling, not from what papa allocates from the common pot, and to have and hold what each person earns. Should we family members now, having become adults, break off these relations? I believe not. Aside from sentiment, we have left primarily a whole number of interests: Economic, political, cultural. Precisely, the common interest and mutual benefit should be the link which unites us. Not the fact that many Russians live in all the republics. This should in itself suggest to the peoples of the republics the way to close cooperation, as an equal among equals, on a partnership basis. The peoples should themselves voluntarily, and not from fear or under compulsion, give up part of their sovereignty, but they must be convinced as to the need for and benefit of such a step.

Generally, Mikhail Sergeyevich, we have up to now lived in a domestic bachelor hostel, but should have built and been living in linked comfortable cottages, whose foundation and walls should be the economy, mutual interest, and the responsibility of each for his own fate. The desire for a restoration of their statehood has taken possession of the masses in Lithuania. The Communist Party has supported this. It seems to me, whether we like it or not, this is a natural process, and is occurring throughout the country. The brakes may be applied to it, but it cannot be stopped. Let the republics which are members of a real unitary union form their own states and negotiate on a mutually acceptable and mutually profitable basis how to live henceforward. After all, not only geopolitical location, but also the economy will in no way allow us to fence ourselves off from one another by a Great Wall of China.

Now about the Communist Party. Let's face it, a united CPSU built on the strict principles of democratic centralism has, alas, in its 70-plus years failed to achieve what it proclaimed, despite the "concrete" unity. Let us bring up for discussion by the country's communists another version. Yes, Lenin was against federation in the party, but it is difficult to predict how he would have acted in the current situation. Why are many people inclined to consider the decision of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress separatism and splittist activity? After all, the main document of the congress—the Declaration on the Independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party—says: The content and development of relations between the Lithuanian Communist Party and the CPSU will depend on mutual understanding, restructuring in the CPSU, and the results of its 28th congress. Why cannot the decisions of the 20th congress be seen as a package of specific proposals of the Lithuanian communists to the 28th CPSU Congress? Let the upcoming congress evaluate them.

Further. There should be no split in the Lithuanian Communist Party. Former party officials and some of the current functionaries should not be in a hurry to grab portfolios and pilfer communists in batches, taking cover behind high-sounding words about the unity of the CPSU. Under whatever slogans cover is sought, the communists who have broken away from the majority will not, for all that, take root in Lithuania. There can be no leaving this hall today without it being said that in Lithuania, up to the 28th CPSU Congress at least, there is one Communist Party. The final point. I wish to address the communists and, through them, all citizens of the republic of non-Lithuanian nationality. Let us renounce, as of today let us rid ourselves of "informing" in our family. As we can see, nothing good has or will come of it. I fully support Mikhail Sergeyevich's answers which he gave in the Fuel Equipment Production Association to the questions concerning the internal affairs of the republic and interethnic relations. We must resolve all these questions here, ourselves, no one anywhere else will solve them for us at the level that is necessary.

Yes, the Poles of the Soviet Union, and there are approximately 2 million of us, have very many problems. Taking advantage of this opportunity, I would like to ask you, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to give the corresponding instruction for the separate study and discussion of this issue. We need to tell the historical truth about our people, who have suffered here, and to chart the paths of their further development together. The Lithuanian Poles have problems also, and we ourselves here, together with the Lithuanians and other people, will solve them. I would like to ask merely, comrades, particularly some long-term party officials, whose personal activity largely contributed to the fact that for considerable numbers of the Polish population the native language has become Russian, do not toss out our people ideas which are unacceptable to the republic's Lithuanian population, do not get the geese excited, as they say. You will not win strong authority for yourselves by slogans about autonomy not buttressed by your specific work on assisting the Poles restore their lost language, culture, and so forth. We must not allow anyone who feels like it to play the Polish card.

Mikhail Sergeyevich, I believe you would be doing right were you, upon leaving, to say to all of us here, from this platform: Communists of all Lithuania, unite!

Voices from the floor: Why not let everyone who wishes to speak do so? Only one side is effectively being expressed! Our requests were ignored at the 20th congress also.... [passage omitted]

Professor I. Kucherov:

Since the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress we have witnessed and are now witnessing a quite shameless method of the formation of cults and worshipers. And, I will be blunt, immodest flattery, which is being heard from this platform, also.

To be honest, one is embarrassed, comrade communists, by these things. I would like in this connection to recall a very dialectical aphorism of the great Hegel: "All that is authentic has reason, all that has reason is authentic." The split in the CPSU, which is being spoken of currently, or, more precisely, the split in the CPSU which is being inferred from the split in the Lithuanian Communist Party, this is, of course, authentically bad. If viewed from one angle. But let us recall: As soon as some abrupt turnabout in society occurs, there are necessarily in the party processes which are connected with its differentiation. Some of its members leave it for this reason or the other, and a particular ideological nucleus, thanks to which the Communist Party lives and operates, is strengthened.

So, proceeding from Hegel's aphorism, I would like to ask you to take a close look at the ongoing process. Is not a self-cleansing of the party occurring with us? A natural self-cleansing process. This process should not, I believe, be impeded. We need, on the contrary, to afford it an opportunity to develop.

Just look at what is happening with us. A grouping has quit the CPSU. What characterizes it? What principles and attributes has it taken with it? It is primarily an alliance of some communists from the executive body with the right wing of "Sajudis," which was recently blackening all communists, blackening the whole Lithuanian Communist Party, and calling Marxism-Leninism a monster. This is the first thing, and this will undoubtedly make its mark on the whole independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Further, it is perfectly obvious that the right wing of "Sajudis" will impart its own, national color of fascination with national euphoria, so to speak, and it will be very difficult for the party to stick to internationalist positions. It will unfailingly slide down into nationalist positions, and we, unfortunately, are observing all this. The worker Pavlovich spoke here, saying that there is a certain terror and pressure—this is a fact; and there's no point making a fuss here. I came yesterday from Druskininkay, having spoken with ordinary workers, not to mention employees, there. They are afraid of losing their jobs, and it is only for this reason that they are not venturing to openly express their candid opinions.

The so-called unanimity, sometimes organized, is largely the result of the pressure of the press and all the mass media. It is no joke when people then say that we are freely moving toward freedom. If freedom and independence start from this, to what, if you'll excuse me, will we come?

It is most interesting that the party which has remained with the CPSU platform and which is now being called the "nocturnal" party and whatever you will, has already produced a new party organizational structure. Here is where the creativity really is, and some people, esteemed Professor Rankyavichyus, I believe, have spoken about creativity here. I would request that the comrades from the Central Committee here present pay attention to the new structure. In just the same way formerly, in the revolutionary period, the soviets put forward the same self-organization and mode of self-organization in the form of a secretaries' council. This experience requires study.

I would like to dwell on the problems of federation. The main idea which the grouping which has quit the CPSU has taken with it is the idea not, however, of a renewal of the federation but of Lithuania's detachment from the federation. The canard to the effect that the desire now is to organize an economic blockade of the Lithuania in liberation has been started. At the same time, that people's deputies from high podiums in Moscow are inciting the nonconclusion of business contracts. But, you will excuse me, who will conclude a contract if he is being publicly insulted before everyone? Is this not understandable?

Speaking about the fate of the federation, I share the viewpoint that all questions need to be decided by political means. But, for all that, it is necessary to bring the state remedial mechanism into play also. As long as blood is being shed and the fire is being fanned, it is possible with us also, if we fail to halt this process in time. I would mention that the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies spoke of the need for a law on the protection of the federation. [passage omitted]

Yu. Karosas, assistant professor at Vilnius University:

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, esteemed guests, esteemed participants in our meeting. You are in no doubt, of course, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that Lithuania's communists are ardent supporters of the policy of perestroyka. We are entirely in sympathy with your political credo, which you expressed the day before yesterday:

The Soviet Union cannot go on living as it has lived and must comprehensively renew itself. However, your current visit to Lithuania has been brought about by the need for an amplification of our positions and certain disagreements. We are very happy that our dialogue is proving to be very candid and sincere and we are sure that we have gained a better understanding of your viewpoint on the processes occurring in the Lithuanian Communist Party, but at the same time we hope that you also have arrived at a fuller understanding of our decisions.

At the meeting the day before yesterday with cultural figures of Lithuania you, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, several times sought from our speakers a clearer substantiation of the Communist Party's decision to become an independent party. It is difficult answering this multifaceted question briefly, but I would like to express a few thoughts on this score.

Of course, the basis of the well-known decision of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress is the national revival of Lithuania brought about by perestroyka. The one is connected with the other, the one is impossible without the other—this is how we understand it. I would like to call attention to the fact that after the CPSU had decided to make democracy the basis of our political life, this was perceived here in the republic primarily as proclamation of the right to self-determination. For us democracy is identical to this right, and not because this is the end point of democracy but because for us democracy begins from this right, from the possibility of its realization.

You, Mikhail Sergeyevich, took democracy seriously; we, accordingly, took our right to freedom seriously. Were we wrong? For this reason the rebuke for an aspiration to the separatism of both Lithuania and the Lithuanian Communist Party sounds very bad to us. In our view, freedom is an inalienable right of a nation, and not an item of luxury, which one can do without. What is terrible for a people is not only the loss of freedom but also the loss of the aspiration to freedom.

I would like here to call attention to an idea of Lenin's, to which he would always resort in studies of the nationality question. This is the fundamental difference between large and small nations. There is a pronounced aspiration currently to consider this to be a purely quantitative difference and to resort to the older and younger brother analogy. Lenin's idea, in my view, is quite different. He emphasizes the qualitative aspect of this difference. A large nation is international since its life in a multinational state not only is not dangerous for it but is useful even. And, the other way about. A small nation is nationalist and aspires to political self-determination since there is for it no other method of preserving itself. Our national history has, alas, proven the soundness of this idea of Lenin's too many times. Therefore, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, please understand us when we hear the discordant chorus singing about our alleged innate nationalism and say that it cannot shake our resolve to be ourselves.

In conclusion I would like to say a couple of words about what in our dialogue are being called realities. You, Mikhail Sergeyevich, have depicted very accurately and colorfully the interdependence of economic affairs and the interweaving of economic relations on the scale of the whole union. We have to agree. This is obvious. The sole point which in this case causes some misunderstanding on our part is the fact that an endeavor to sever these relations and break up our economic integration is being imputed to us. But can we have an interest in breaking up what is of vital importance to us and without which we simply cannot get by? Must a people and the nation forfeit an understanding of their interest only because they have become politically sovereign? Only a socially blind person could take this step. If there is a threat of the severance of the economic connection, it does not, I am sure, come from us. As a sovereign state, we would naturally remain economically within a community, a community whose basis would be the mode of uniting peoples which has been sufficiently proven in the world—mutually profitable economic interest and the market. We would thereby, as I understand it, together be an integral part of the common European home.

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, the world knows you as a real humanist. We are sure that you sincerely wish all people well and understand that a people cannot be made happy against its wishes. May God help you in your humane endeavors, as they say.

M.S. Gorbachev: I hope so. But I count on you, on your assistance also. (applause) [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Adviser on Soviet Political Change

AU1102160490 Rome ANSA in English 1237 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, February 10—The Soviet Union is on the verge of becoming a presidential republic, according to Vadim Zagladin, foreign policy advisor to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, in an interview with Rome's LA REPUBBLICA daily.

Commenting on the results of the landmark Soviet Communist Party Central Committee meeting which wound up three days ago, Zagladin told LA REPUBBLICA, "We had arrived at a point where we could wait no longer, and the choice of a multiparty system for the Soviet Union of the perestroyka age was inevitable."

The Central Committee, at the end of three days of heated debate, voted to ask parliament to alter the Constitution and pave the way for a multiparty system in the Soviet Union. The decision of Gorbachev to ask parliament for full presidential powers is a request, Zagladin explained, echoed by the party's Politburo and the Central Committee.

"We believe," Zagladin went on, "that this change can be put off no longer, and events of the last year, since Gorbachev became president of the Supreme Soviet as well as party secretary have borne this out."

According to the foreign policy advisor, Gorbachev's double role as party chief and head of state takes up a large amount of his time, with the Soviet president obliged to attend all meetings of the Supreme Soviet, the nation's parliament which sits for up to eight months a year.

"We have come to realise," Zagladin said, "that there are situations in which someone has to be ready to make key decisions immediately, and has to be able to do so without waiting for parliament to gather. We have to create, therefore, a constitutional figure who, on behalf of the state, can decide to intervene, while still remaining subject to parliamentary controls on his actions."

For the moment, Gorbachev's foreign policy advisor went on, this idea of setting up what he said might be termed a presidential republic is merely at the planning stage, and must receive approval from parliament. "But the model we are using is fairly similar to the French or that of United States, with some alterations to allow for our country's specific situation."

Zagladin said that a president elected by universal suffrage as happens in the U.S. and France, rather than one chosen by parliament as is the case in Italy, was preferable. "We are aware that the presidents of France and the U.S. have constitutionally more power than the Italian president," Zagladin remarked.

"This is precisely what we want," Zagladin stressed, adding that the president must have decision-making powers based on popular support.

Turning to the issue of a multi-party system, Zagladin said "today there are many movements in the Soviet Union which function like true potential parties. We have to face up to reality and admit that the Communist Party must fight for its power, and must get used forging alliances and coalitions with other forces."

According to Zagladin, there can be no doubt that Gorbachev emerged from this week's Central Committee meeting in a stronger position than before. "It was a hard-fought plenum, not at all easy, but decisive. Perhaps we really moved from democratisation to democracy," he said.

Ryzhkov Speech to Syktyvkar Meeting

PM1202143590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Key Issues Of Economic Perestroyka"]

[Text] The decisions of the recently held CPSU Central Committee plenum are creating an unambiguous mood in the party and in society: It is necessary, people believe, to break the negative trends in the country's life, resolutely put an end to apathy, and overcome confusion. For this it is necessary, above all, to step up work sharply.

Hence the careful search for new opportunities to enhance production efficiency in all sectors. This is the way to strengthen the material basis of perestroyka and enhance the Soviet people's well-being. The participants in a working conference held 9 February in Syktyvkar, where N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, was present, focused their attention on a package of problems connected with this.

His stay in the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] has a background history. A group of USSR people's deputies from the autonomous republic sent an invitation to the Soviet government head to visit the Komi ASSR to help solve a number of often difficult problems on which the rate of development of its economy and social sphere directly depend. N.I. Ryzhkov had a detailed look at many of these problems during his tour of the autonomous republic, on which he was accompanied by a number of leaders of principal national economic sectors and economic departments and eminent specialists.

The working conference in Syktyvkar attracted an audience that essentially represented all spheres of the autonomous republic's life. There were workers and engineers, scientists and party workers, members of the creative intelligentsia, and rural workers. At their request N.I. Ryzhkov paid special attention to problems of restoring and improving the health of the country's economy that have a direct bearing on the effectiveness of the party's social policy.

Addressing the conference participants, he stressed that one of the party's most important tasks is that of consolidating all healthy forces in society in order to strengthen the economy and improve Soviet people's lives. Special attention was paid to this question at the CPSU Central Committee plenum and I, as USSR Council of Ministers chairman, would also like to dwell on it in more detail.

A complex of coordinated measures to restore the economy's health and successfully tackle social tasks is determined by the government program endorsed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

This program, as is known, includes measures to restore the economy's health in 1990-1992, the stages of economic reform, and principled approaches to the elaboration of the 13th Five-Year Plan. It is the result of a choice of solutions on the basis of a multiplicity of variant calculations and comparisons.

In order to find a rational way of further developing the economic reform three possible options were examined. A choice had to be made concerning future action. Either by small improvements in the economic mechanism spread over time or a headlong dash into the abyss of market uncertainty without the requisite conditions and effective regulators. Both were rejected. A radical-moderate option was chosen, combining vigorous measures to deepen the reform with real action at all levels of management taking into account society's objective readiness to accept change. The calculations confirm that this path will lead more quickly to the goal, and, most important, it will be the least expensive, N.I. Ryzhkov said.

Now, the approaches to the compilation of the five-year plan. There was an analysis of alternatives here too. Having evaluated the sum total of economic, social, and political problems that have become dramatically worse, the government decided on the option envisaging an accelerated social reorientation of the economy in the 13th Five-Year Plan, which means curbing the development of the base sectors to that end. This conclusion was backed by the Congress of People's Deputies.

The next thing I want to focus on is the matter of the periods of economic recovery and restoration of the economy's normal functions. Two aspects were taken into account here: First, that the proposals should fully take into account the actual situation and, second, that they should ensure that the set goals are attained. What fits the bill is the variant that involves splitting a six-year period into two stages: 1990-1992 and 1993-1995.

In the first stage the need is for a range of emergency measures to overcome the economic crisis, above all the budget deficit and the consumer market imbalance. The method of attaining the goal at this stage is based on a balanced combination of tough directive measures and the growing influence of economic levers. In short, market relations will start to develop alongside directive management. At the second stage economic methods will come fully into play and the market will become fully active.

In this approach, the urgent measures will be geared not only to overcoming the principal problems but also to creating a foundation for switching to solutions of a strategic nature and actually building a new type of economic system.

It was important to establish on what kind of foundation this economic model should be built, what kind of cornerstones should be laid. Of course, in the first place there is a diversity of forms of ownership, which are equal and competitive. The government's position on this fully accords with the published draft Law on Ownership.

But this alone is not enough. The new basic relations are supplemented by a different kind of plan management, in which economic methods and market relations, combined with state regulation, will be the chief instruments for managing production activity.

Finally, all this is backed up by a system of social guarantees that is intended to give citizens equal opportunities to harmoniously and fully exploit their abilities and provide a fitting life for all members of society.

The 1990-1992 period is the first and most important stage in restoring the national economy's health and implementing the concept of radical economic reform. This period will see the implementation of a range of emergency measures to overcome negative phenomena in the economy, above all phenomena such as the gross imbalance in the consumer market and the financial and money circulation chaos.

The current year, 1990, has a special place in this period. The foundation for overcoming the crisis phenomena is to be created this year. Above all, the government head said, it is necessary to implement priority measures to ease social tensions in the country.

A major structural maneuver is needed in order to achieve this. The acceleration of the pace has to be achieved almost entirely by the growth of the consumer sector of the economy, with simultaneous stabilization and, in a number of cases, reduction of reproductive resources. The increase in the production of industrial group "B" goods will be 7.6 percent and of group "A" only 0.8 percent.

Centralized state capital investments in production construction will be R27 billion less than the calculations for the five-year plan and investments in the social sphere will increase by R5 billion. This adjustment of the proportions in favor of the consumer sector of the economy will affect all sections of the plan. It is an abrupt and extremely difficult change, but it is necessary because of the emergency situation in the country.

The solution of these tasks, N.I. Ryzhkov went on to stress, will require hard work and concerted effort by all components of the national economy and all working people, a major organizational effort, the establishment of order in the production and distribution spheres, and the strengthening of discipline.

I must be frank and say that the implementation of the 1990 plan will be an exceedingly difficult task. Particularly as last year the plan was underfulfilled in many very important indicators. In 1989 GNP increased by only three percent, national income by 2.4 percent, and industrial production by 1.7 percent. The rate of growth of consumer goods production was higher. Production of nonfoodstuffs increased by 7.7 percent and foodstuffs by 3.2 percent. But this is R6 billion less than the foodstuffs plan and R2 billion less than the nonfoodstuffs plan. The main point, he went on to say, is that the increase in consumer goods production is lagging behind the increase in the population's monetary incomes.

Preparation for the switch to new work principles and the creation of conditions for their utilization are yet another feature of the current year, N.I. Ryzhkov continued.

He gave a detailed account of the principles of the preparation of laws intended to give a fillip to the transformation of ownership relations and legislation on land, on the enterprise, on a unified tax system, on the State Bank, and others.

This is by no means a complete list of the most important legislative and normative acts which are to be adopted this year. When preparing the relevant draft laws and other decisions, the government will continue and expand the practice of involving labor collectives, specialists, and scientists in the discussion of very important matters and the practice of jointly seeking solutions that take into account the interests of all strata and groups of society.

Finally, in 1990, all enterprises, all components of economic management, and executive organs of power are faced with the tough job of shaping the plan for the 13th Five-Year Period. The guidelines and principled approaches to the next five-year period, approved by the Congress of People's Deputies, must now find concrete embodiment in enterprises', sectors', and regions' plans.

Therefore, N.I. Ryzhkov said, this year none of us can afford a faltering start; we have a great deal of selfless work to do. But we must all be aware that the very complex tasks facing the country will not be solved without changing attitudes toward work, without a great sense of responsibility for the job in hand, and without committed labor.

In present conditions, the way each republic, oblast, kray, or city manages to finish 1990 and prepare for the switch to regional economic accountability principles is exceedingly important. I am focusing your attention on this because all that I have said is directly linked both to economic recovery and to the stages of the economic reform.

Returning to the theme of the government's program, its head stressed once again that only the consolidation of all society's forces in the interests of creative work to overcome the extremely complex situation in the national economy will make for real results within the projected timeframe.

Of course, N.I. Ryzhkov said, I have not covered all the questions connected with the development of the country's econonmy, not to mention that of your republic. But the trip has demonstrated anew that special attention should be paid to this region.

It is a region with a great future and enormous potential, but it has serious problems too. They are facing all sectors. They are particularly affecting working people at coal enterprises. Many questions were examined during the meetings in Vorkuta. They were concrete conversations and decisions. As for the socioeconomic development of the Pechora coalfield as a whole, we are planning to adopt a government decision on this in March. The autonomous republic's government has placed before the country's government a number of serious problems concerning the development of other sectors and areas. Indeed, comrades have made specific constructive proposals in speeches today. They will require proper study and analysis and the adoption of the requisite decisions. This alone demonstrates, in my view, that the tour of the autonomous republic has been useful.

During the conference its participants made many specific proposals and expressed wishes aimed at making resolute changes for the better in the national economic sphere. N.I. Ryzhkov answered questions connected with various aspects of economic improvement. In particular, a group of questions concerned the attitude of the government and its head toward monetary reform. He emphasized that the USSR Council of Ministers takes an unambiguous and firm stand: We will not undertake any monetary reform. Such "shock therapy" is unacceptable for resolving complex problems of the economy. I have already spoken of this, N.I. Ryzhkov recalled, at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Detailed replies were given to other questions too.

Yeltsin Supports New RSFSR Constitution

LD0602114290 Moscow World Service in Russian 1040 GMT 6 Feb 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day"]

[Text] Boris Yeltsin, USSR people's deputy and member of the CPSU Central Committee, following a series of meetings with his voters in Sverdlovsk, in the Urals, has stated that these have helped him to refine and even revise certain nuances of his election program.

Yeltsin has been nominated as a candidate for Russian Socialist Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputy. The elections are to be held on 4 March. His program is devoted to the economic, spiritual, and national renaissance of Russia. In Yeltsin's opinion, this should be based on a new constitution for the RSFSR, taking as its premise the principles of separation of powers and observance of the democratic rights and freedoms of citizens.

'Election Platform' Outlined

LD0502172590 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 5 Feb 90

[Excerpts] A leading Soviet radical, Boris Yeltsin, after holding a series of meetings with his constituents in the city of Sverdlovsk in the Urals, has said they helped him to modify and even review some of the details of his election platform. [passage omitted]

Mr. Yeltsin's program centers on Russia's economic, cultural, and national rebirth which, he says, could be brought about by Russia's new constitution based on the separation of powers and on democratic rights and civil liberties.

Vorontsov Denies Rumors of Moscow, Odessa Pogroms

LD1202155990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1515 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow, 12 Feb (TASS)—Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, today assessed as "provacative in the highest degree" the rumors being spread in recent days about pogroms being prepared against Jews in Moscow and Odessa, and about Jewish communities being ruled by fear. Speaking at a news conference here he stated that "these provocations could cause people to emigrate from the USSR who were not preparing to do so."

Among those possibly spreading these provocative rumors, he also named "sources close to Israel," noting that "this will be investigated".

"All Soviet citizens are defended by the law, of course, no pogroms will be tolerated," Yuliy Vorontsov stated. "Any such attempts wil be decisively halted."

As is well-known, the USSR Committee for State Security made a statement on this subject last week. This document stresses in part: "As for the rumors being spread concerning pogroms, there is no concrete evidence to support these claims." Nevertheless, it continues, "The USSR KGB is following the development of the situation and will take the necessary measures if tension escalates."

KGB Denies Rumors About Pogroms

LD0902143190 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 9 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—The USSR State Security Committee distributed the following statement here today:

"Rumours about alleged pogroms against Jews, Azerbaijanis and Armenians have been widely circulating in Moscow and other places recently. To give credibility to these rumours, those who spread them cite the nationalistically-tinted 'programmes' of some informal associations, as well as hooligan and provocative attacks by individual elements, like the one that recently took place at the Central Writers' House in Moscow. Rumours about pogroms rouse people and exacerbate the social situation.

"Within its competence especially that part which concerns protection of the constitutional rights of Soviet citizens, the USSR State Security Committee cannot ignore manifestations of nationalist extremism and takes measures to combat them as provided for by the law.

"As for the rumours about pogroms that are being spread, there is no concrete evidence to support these claims. The only information that the State Security bodies has been receiving are rumours themselves, reports of them by the mass media and requests by individual citizens for explanations about one rumour or another. Nevertheless, the KGB is following the development of the situation and will take the necessary measures if the tension escalates. The State Security Committee relies on assistance from the public and those who know concrete facts about illegal actions or intentions to commit them.

"In these conditions it is imortant for the mass media to cover such sensitive issues in a more balanced way and not to circulate unverified information, because appeals to violence on one occasion provoke appeals for violence on other occasions."

Kiev Authorities Assail Pogrom Rumors

LD1102154290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 11 Feb 90

[By TASS correspondent Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev, 11 Feb (TASS)—The politburo of the Kiev City Party Committee and the presidium of the Kiev Executive Committee of the City Soviet of People's Deputies have described as provocative and aimed at destabilizing the political situation in the city the rumors that have been circulated here about possible pogroms and persecution of Jews, Russians, and persons of other non-Ukrainian nationalities.

The rumors that have emerged recently have prompted tension, nerviousness, and lack of confidence in the future among some people. The Politburo and the presidium have called on the population to be calm, sensible, and tolerant. "We wish to assure Kiev residents," the appeal published today says, "that the organs of state power will resolutely put a stop to the actions of the political instigators, those who try to insult the honor and dignity of citizens of any nationality, and those show show disrespect for Soviet laws." The city authorities are calling on the population to rebuff irresponsible people and adventurists who are tying to worsen the situation and to push people towards the brink of danger.

Pro-Gdlyan Demonstrators Criticized

PM1202165990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "On Glasnost and Incensed Readers"]

[Text] On the evening of 9 February a crowd gathered on the patch of ground in front of the editorial building. A crowd of 200-300 people. Sheets of paper appealing for "Gdlyan to be defended" were pinned to the wall. Yells were heard from the crowd: "Down with the Mafia!" "Shame on IZVESTIYA!" While the most eccentric young people ostentatiously burnt crumpled issues of the newspaper....

What happened?

The day before IZVESTIYA reprinted—we stress reprinted—a conversation published in Tashkent's SELSKAYA PRAVDA with USSR people's deputies who are members of the congress commission to hear materials linked with the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigation group headed by T. Gdlyan. The commission went to Uzbekistan and did a tremendous amount of work. People's Deputies V. Yarin, N. Strukov, V. Aleksandrin, and V. Adylov shared their impressions during a conversation with SELSKAYA PRAVDA's correspondent. We want to draw attention to the fact that, while reprinting the article under the rubric "In the Focus of the Press," IZVESTIYA drew no conclusions, allowing the reader, as it said in the introduction, "to judge everything for himself."

To be honest, we did not expect the unique reaction demonstrated by the group of "vexed" readers outside the editorial office. What of glasnost and pluralism of opinion if people's deputies have no right to voice in the press their convictions and the result of their lengthy work? Or must we believe that, under the guise of dissent with an individual article, IZVESTIYA has been given an ultimatum as to what it can and cannot print. What a remarkable glasnost we will have then!

A glasnost that only suits those who have always wanted to listen only to themselves, who are not interested in establishing the truth and seeing the law triumph.

Prosecutor To Seek Gdlyan Ouster

PM1202122590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report; "At USSR Prosecutor's Office"]

[Text] A collegium session was held at the USSR Prosecutor's Office 8 February to examine the question of gross violations of the law committed by T.Kh. Gdlyan and N.V. Ivanov, investigators of specially important cases under the USSR Prosecutor General.

A report by V.I. Ilyukhin, chief of a USSR Prosecutor's Office administration, who headed the investigation into instances of the violation of the law by a number of investigators working in Gdlyan's group, prosecutors responsible for oversight, and other employees, revealed numerous cases of arbitrariness, lawlessness, and the outrage of human dignity committed by Gdlyan and Ivanov and some other investigators from their group. According to the report by the chief of the USSR Prosecutor's Office administration, during the investigation, which was carried out over a period of more than eight months, over 500 witnesses were questioned, there were numerous confrontations and hearings of testimony, and a large number of documents were studied.

The collegium decided to make a submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet to obtain consent to the release of USSR People's Deputies T.Kh. Gdlyan and N.V. Ivanov from their duties and to the institution of proceedings against them under the law.

Major shortcomings in the work of prosecutor's oversight were sharply criticized.

The collegium outlined concrete measures to conclude the investigation of violations in the investigation group headed by Gdlyan and Ivanov, as well as to strengthen legality in investigation and prosecuting work and to ensure the reliable defense of Soviet people's rights.

Taking part in the collegium's work were USSR People's Deputies R.A. Medvedev and V.A. Yarin, cochairmen of the commission to hear materials connected with the activity of the USSR Prosecutor's Office investigation group headed by T.Kh. Gdlyan; as well as USSR People's Deputies Yu.Yu. Sokolov, N.I. Ignatovich, and B.S. Safarov, members of the Supreme Soviet Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals Committee, and representatives of social organizations and the mass media.

Vremya Seen as Obsolete, Seven Days Lauded

90US0501A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 5, 3 Feb 90 p 11

[Article by E. Chekalova: "Seven Days That Shook 'Vremya'"]

[Text] "Vremya" [Time] was once called the business-card of Central Television. Today the country's main news program is often cited to show the distance by which Central Television has fallen behind the press. And it is not that "Vremya" changed, on the contrary, it has been changing too slowly.

Definitely, it is not just "news of tractors" any more. People of unorthodox ideas, businesslike reporting, and sensible interviews—all of these appear in the program. "Vremya" made our life more recognizable on the screen and it also made life in other countries look more authentic. But we, the audience, still feel unhappy about it as we sense that the strict regulations once applied to the program still linger on. Most controversial ideological debates of today, the opposing points of view, and simple last-minute information on some unflattering facts—all of this remains rather "untimely" for the "Vremya" program.

It has happened before that "Vremya" presented one kind of information about the events in Nagorno-Karabakh, or Transcaucasia, or the Baltic republics at the same time as the "Vzglyad" [Viewpoint] and "Before and After Midnight" programs and the Leningrad "Fifth Wheel" program provided quite the opposite point of view which later was supported at the highest levels. Failures of this nature did not enhance the prestige of the country's main news program at all. Here is a typical viewer comment: "Vremya" serves to relay the officially approved information that is never completely honest.

It seems that the television viewers were not the only ones to feel dissatisfaction. The "Seven Days" program was launched at 2100 Moscow time, on 12 November of last year and ever since then we watch it every Sunday as our main television news program. This was our impression of the first broadcast: It is not just a new program, but a different concept for the All-Union information channel. From the later programs only the New Year one could be compared to the first broadcast in its intensity, but in general the first impression seems to hold true.

At last the Central Television news has become a writer/anchorman program as it is in every civilized country; that means it became more personalized and less regulated. Here are the results: According to opinion polls, in two months "Seven Days" has become as popular as the night time programs.

Here is another curious note: The head of the information department, Eduard Sagalaev, was the writer/anchorman of the first program. It is no secret that the viewers often think of television journalists and television administrators as of two opposing parties: One side comes up with some crucial information and the other side edits this information before it gets to the screen to make it unrecognizable and unemotional. In this case the editor-in-chief, a member of the Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] board, started the program with the following message: "We understand how many rumors, falsehoods, incorrect and even dishonest data there are around. We think that our viewers have the right to know the real state of things and to make a conscious choice. You can count on our objectivity and honesty. We will not impose our opinion on you, nor will we hide our point of view."

One would think: What is new here? Everybody knows from both the theory and practice of television that "personalized" information is one of its main principles. And so it is. However, the application of this popular notion in Soviet television was rather rare and at first meant using the announcers who used to read lines written by someone else whose name nobody knew. Now we understand that such announcements are as far removed from real communication as can be. But earlier we thought we knew all these Anechkas and Valechkas very well and we endowed them with imaginary personal traits and interests, and detailed life stories. For that reason any interval in their schedules immediately caused rumors to spread all over the country: What else happened to them? They were the people famous by their fame, i.e. frequency of their appearance on the screen. They personally had no responsibility for any of the broadcasts and we never had any claims to them. We knew just too well: the screen speaks on behalf of the people.

Evening programs were the first to offer their own points of view and information that had not been smoothed over and approved "from above". They started it and right away they found themselves in the position of being "Vremya's" opponents. It became important to create a new, official, All-Union news program in order to overcome the viewers' distrust of television information programming in general. Such a program would be aired in the middle of the evening broadcasts and in such a way it would emphasize the position of the Gosteleradio.

For Eduard Sagalaev and the other permanent anchor of the "Seven Days", Aleksandr Tikhomirov, to be the writers of the program meant to be personally responsible for the selection and presentation of the most important events of the week. And one thing can be stated quite definitely now: The "Seven Days" program has not had any of the serious gaps yet for which "Vremya" is notorious—something has happened but the information about it is aired only on the short waves.

The counter demonstration in Moscow on 7 November, the storming of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] building by the participants of a spontaneous meeting in Kishinev, expressive pictures from the two well-known meetings in Leningrad, last-minute reporting on the breathtaking political changes in Czechoslovakia, the GDR, and Romania, stern results of the VTsIOM [All-Union Center for Analyzing Public Opinion] sociological research, uninhibited interviews with very diverse people: those who fill locker rooms at factories and the "dramatis personae" who interest everyone, from A. Kashpirovskiy to B. Gidaspov—all these and much other material of "Seven Days" were noticeably different from the routine everyday television information both in subject matter and the angle of their presentation. The main difference lies not so much in the stories themselves (though it is hard to imagine some of them done by "Vremya") as in the general direction of the better broadcasts as a whole.

As early as in 1985 A. Tikhomirov tried to explain in his interview by SOVETSKAYA KULTURA: "The main news program of the country should build its coverage so that, first, the viewer can see an important societal problem behind a concrete fact and, second, he can understand the essence of our current approach to the solution of this problem. Only then can we talk about the social and political orientation of our audience." I think, the weekly news program presented an attractive format and allowed, at last, putting long-standing ideas into practice. One week is exactly such a period of time that a news story can still remain news, but at the same time has to survive as most important in the news natural selection process. One thing strikes me as remarkable: Sagalaev and Tikhomirov have quite different presentation styles and personal likings but they both aim at objectivity. When they covered the most controversial stories like the miners' strike, the two Leningrad meetings, the dissent in the Lithuanian Communist Party, they provided equal time for each of the opposing parties involved. Not always but rather often they presented their own position. For instance, I remember the passionate and erudite polemics between A. Tikhomirov and a Politburo member which, of course, was not a routine matter. However, I tend to explain Tikhomirov's daring not solely by his personal qualities, but also by that same responsibility that the program's writer should feel when trying to maintain standards. For that reason, by the way, I would not recommend expanding the number of writers/anchormen of the program. We have already learned from the experience of "Vzglyad" that passing a program over from hand to hand brings the day when the program no longer goes on the air. The viewers then just sit and try to guess: Did the level of the program drop down that drastically or was there no one left to defend the principles of the program.

"Seven Days" is often compared to "Vzglyad" anyway. They call it the "Vzglyad" for adults, "Vzglyad" without music. To me these comparisons simply show how very few programs there still are at central television that are honest and not boring as far as their format. These very general principles make up practically the only difference between the evening shows, with their inherent attempt at sensationalism and exclusiveness, and the quiet news review which aims to orient the viewer in the stream of events. I say "practically" because in "Seven Days" one can also see the hand of young journalists. The news programs were always known for the paucity of their graphics; therefore, the visually expressive stories of Vladislav Flyarkovskiy or dramatic and challenging stories of Dmitriy Kiselev and Petr Orlov and the poetic etudes by Aleksandra Livanskaya seem very unusual compared to the old format. In my opinion, we should preserve and enhance this quality of something unusual and unhackneyed; all the more so because it is still too often that we can notice in "Seven Days" the imprints of the past "Vremyas". In those days a commentator was no different than an announcer, they understood presentation as a kind of bridge between the video clips and not as an interpretation of them; the only reasons we heard were of the type: the collective farms are better than individual ones because they are better.

Before the New Year, a famous French astrologer predicted for "Seven Days" the road through obstacles to the stars. I do not believe in fortune telling, so I want to say just what I see: There are new trends in our television news today. Let us hope that they will turn into new directions.

Head of New Research Center Interviewed

90UN0877A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report on interview with V. Lukin, doctor of historical sciences, professor, and chief of the Center for Analysis and Forecasts attached to the USSR Supreme Soviet, by G. Alimov; date and place not specified: "A Team of Parliamentary Experts—A Center for Analysis and Forecasting Established Under the Supreme Soviet of the Country"]

[Text] **Appointed to head this service, which is new to the highest legislative organ of the country, is 52-year-old V. Lukin, a doctor of historical sciences and a professor. He is a graduate of the Moscow V.I. Lenin Pedagogical Institute. After completing postgraduate study at the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences in Moscow, he was occupied with international questions for a long time; he worked on the journal PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM and afterwards at the United States of America and Canada Institute in Moscow; from 1987 to 1989, he was an official of the Administration of Estimates and Planning of the USSR MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs]**

V. Lukin is alone for the time being: His team is just being formed. Nobody, not even the occupant of this small office in the Kremlin himself, knows in detail how the work of the center that is being created will be structured.

"We are starting from zero," my interlocutor told me. "But we know what we want: In time, our center should become a well-organized, mobile, and reliable research service of the Soviet parliament similar to the U.S. Congressional Research Service or the research service of a European parliament."

"I accepted the offer to head the new service, because I am convinced: A normally working parliament cannot do without such an institute," V. Lukin believes. "This is indicated by foreign experience and by our own, albeit brief, experience. The Supreme Soviet of the land needs its own, independent group of experts, analysts, and advisers."

[Alimov] A quick reaction team?

[Lukin] No, as I understand it, we are not assigned the role of fire brigade, although I admit that situations could arise when we would find ourselves in a situation where we were "running out of time" to recommend the most acceptable outcome to one or another question from our standpoint. You understand: The decisions are not ours—we are responsible for skillful forecasts and well-considered advice. This simply might not happen, if my colleagues and I began to concentrate only on the "topic of the day." We must look into the future and see it correctly, utilizing those forecasting methodologies that are available in science, and on this basis make recommendations. Of course, not in the form of beautiful and general concepts: Democracy is good, and a law-governed state is also good. We can rightfully be expected to come up with specific and practical ideas, and what the best way would be to move towards objectives that are desirable for our society.

[Alimov] What kinds of specialist profiles interest you most of all?

[Lukin] Everyone participating in the creation of the group believes that we cannot do without economists, sociologists, specialists, for example, on problems of military-political and international security, and more. In our uneasy time, which is fraught with conflict, we need a specialist in the technology of handling crisis situations. Call it, if you like, conflictology.

[Alimov] Is there not a danger that over time you may retreat within yourselves and transform yourselves into some sort of council of wise men?

[Lukin] We are far from the idea that six of us could convene and think of everything. This is nonsense! The main objective of our group lies elsewhere—not to become a closed club, but a sort of little bridge between the parliament and the best intellectual forces of society that could help the deputies comprehend the processes that are taking place. We will have various forms of discussion, not excluding also, what I conditionally refer to as "Kremlin teas" at a roundtable. I think that a frank, confidential, and free exchange of opinions, and an opportunity to speak not in a style that is used in a rally, but in a style that is academic, searching, and free of agitation and oratorical arrogance, will make it possible to develop new ideas and approaches.

[Alimov] Will it be possible, within the framework of your service, to play some kinds of situations and to conduct practical games, which are taken very seriously in the West?

[Lukin] I think that this is necessary. Simulation games are indispensable. More than any other, this form contributes to a "brainstorm," and it discloses subtleties that are frequently lost sight of in a real situation. In the West, the technology of such games has been developed in detail. I have some experience in them. When I was still working in the Institute of the United States of America and Canada of the USSR Academy of Sciences, we conducted simulation exercises with Harvard University, with its John Kennedy School of Government. For example, the hypothetical course of a crisis situation in the Near East was transmitted over television. At the most critical moment, as happens in detective stories, the sequence stopped. Teams from each of the Near East countries, the big powers, etc., joined in the game in a search for possible ways out of the crisis. I recall that I played the role of Mao Zedong, and an American colleague was my consultant.

[Alimov] Do you think it is possible, for example, that M.S. Gorbachev or N.I. Ryzhkov will take part in practical games in your center?

[Lukin] Why not? I do not doubt that they are people with inquiring minds, so that if it were not for a lack of time...

[Alimov] Since that is true, perhaps some of you will "play" for them.

[Lukin] Perhaps. It is not a matter of personalities here, but of functions. Even the role of God can be played in a game.

[Alimov] Analysis and forecasting requires information. Without knowledge of the situation in a country and emerging problems, it will hardly be possible for you to work effectively...

[Lukin] This, of course, is so. That is why, along with the organization of our service, an information center is being established under the Supreme Soviet. We plan to collaborate with it closely. I can add that the creation of a sociological service within the framework of our center is proposed. True, at first it will conduct polls only among the people's deputies and members of the Supreme Soviet. We might not have enough strength to do very much at first. Incidentally, the legislators themselves are showing a great interest in polls. Polls help them to understand each other better and to analyze the dynamics and positions regarding what is happening in the deputy corps itself. We are planning polls among the deputies on a whole number of specific topical problems. In time we will even take a stab at the resolution of more complex tasks—sounding out public opinion with respect to the work of the Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies, and the decisions they made. We realize that we cannot conduct this work without the cooperation of other sociological services that are already established, or are being established.

[Alimov] Please explain whether your service, for example, will conduct expert analyses of draft laws?

[Lukin] No, we do not have this kind of authority. We intend to participate aggressively in the development of major draft laws, and we will assist in getting scientists and specialists involved in this work, that is, professional and academic expert analysis. As you know, dozens of committees and commissions are working in the Supreme Soviet. Many of them have not yet acquired their own active and ramified expert analysis base. We think that, in principle, such a group should be attached to each committee and each commission. We are ready to provide methodological assistance in organizing meetings of deputies with experts (such systematic meetings are called hearings in the American Congress). This form of work is still in an embryonic stage in our parliament. As a matter of fact, parliamentary hearings have not been organized at an appropriate level yet.

[Alimov] You said that parliamentary research services have existed for a long time in other countries. Are you thinking of setting up working ties with them?

[Lukin] We plan to. One of the tasks of our group is to study the experience of foreign parliamentarianism as a whole. We are preparing to collaborate actively with similar foreign centers. We also have already made contacts with the U.S. Congressional Research Group. In my opinion, the experience of the work of the European Parliament will be of great interest to the USSR Supreme Soviet, as will the experience of those countries who work on a federative basis, and where the legislators are faced with interethnic and language problems similar to ours. With the Indian parliament for example.

[Alimov] What kinds of problems will the center address immediately after it is formed?

[Lukin] Those that everyone is talking about. Namely, the political structure of the society, the strong and weak sides of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of People's Deputies, and interethnic problems. We will work on problems of civilized reaction to social tensions, and seek ways that would help to resolve crisis situations quickly.

Practice, of course, will bring its own amendments to our activity. The main thing is not to stand still, and to search continuously. I think that only then will we really become genuine assistants and advisers to the parliamentarians. However, for the time being, we must get ourselves set up and more or less equip ourselves. I have in mind technical equipment. In our difficult time, this is also a problem. Even in the center of the capital....

Regional Affairs

'Enraged' Residents Rally in Dushanbe

Five Reportedly Killed

LD1302063390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service at 0430 GMT on 13 February carries a five-minute report on the situation in Dushanbe, Tajikistan, where a state of emergency was declared on 12 February owing to public disturbances.

The report is presented by Moscow Radio correspondent (Muzafar Madzhidov) in Tajikistan. He notes that the situation is currently calm but he would like to remind the listeners of the background to the state of emergency in Dushanbe. He says, "On 11 February there was an unofficial rally in the capital of Tajikistan. People gathered at the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee building. They were primarily young people, students, around 3,000 people were there. They shouted slogans such as 'Down with Armenians!'" (Madzhidov) reports that the demonstration was spawned by rumors that 5,000 Armenian refugees had come to Dushanbe to be given housing in new estate complexes. He says this enraged the local people, some of whom had waited years for new housing. He notes that the local people do not believe the denials by the first secretary and other party officials. He says the people were told they would receive an "exhaustive" reply to their questions in 24 hours. When the people gathered again to hear the authorities' position, (Madzhidov) states, they were met by two units of the militia, armed with batons, wearing helmets and carrying plastic shields. He notes that the militia's presence angered those gathered and they proceeded to storm the Central Committee building. (Madzhidov) says police reinforcements were sent to control the rioting, the first secretary appeared to address the crowd, but they did not heed him.

[Madzhidov) states further, "Meanwhile, the Armenian refugees, and according to more precise data there were just 39 of them, had been sent off the Yerevan by plane on the morning of 12 February. Over 100 Armenian inhabitants of Dushanbe left with them. However, that was already of no interest to the demonstrators. The voice of reason had stopped working. (?The thousands) became more furious. Blank shots and shots fired into the air gave rise only to animation, laughter, or rather ridicule. They began to swagger. They began [words indistinct] to move forward, to burn motor vehicles, trolleybuses, and buses. There were practially no windows left on the facade of the Central Committee building. Everything around was burning, smoking. Some of the rogues carried out pogroms. Pogroms were carried out. Shops, [word indistinct], pavillions, household services were looted. The rogues, acting in a hooligan manner, beat up innocent people. The orgy continued for several hours. There were not enough forces to stop it, to curb it. Then, having waited for the precise time, 2200 hours [1900 GMT], the Tajikistan Supreme Soviet Presidium decided to introduce in the city a state of emergency, a curfew. However, by that time, 70 people had already been injured and five killed. Izatillo Khayeyev, chairman of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic council of ministers gave these figures in his address on republican television. Tanks entered the city at 2200. I would say that overnight things have passed calmly. However, now, people are once again gathering on the square at the party Central Committee. The duty unit in this republic told me. That is the situation."

State of Emergency, Curfew Declared

LD1202172590 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Dushanbe February 12 TADZHIKTA-TASS—In connection with a sharp aggravation of the situation in Dushanbe, the capital of Soviet Tajikistan, the breaching of public order, manifestations of extremism accompanied by mass disorders and pogroms, and acts of arson and looting, the Presidium of the republican Supreme Soviet has decreed to proclaim a state of emergency and to introduce a curfew from 10 PM to 6 AM in Dushanbe, starting on February 12.

Tajik Interior Minister M. Navzhuvanov has been appointed city commandant.

Looting, Arson Reported

AU1202191490 Paris AFP in English 1835 GMT 12 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Feb 12 (AFP)—Authorities in the central Asian republic of Tadzhikstan declared a state of emergency in the capital Dushanbe Monday night because of "mass disorders", accompanied by arson and looting, TASS news agency said.

A 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. curfew was imposed, TASS said.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Tadzhikstan acted "because of the worsening situation" in the city, including "demonstrations of extremism, mass disorders accompanied by pogroms, fires and looting", the news agency said.

The republic's interior minister had been put in charge of Dushanbe, TASS said.

It failed to give casualty figures or say what had caused the violence.

However the Radio Moscow publication INTERFAX said a nationalist meeting was held in Dushanbe on Sunday to protest against plans to resettle Armenian refugees from the strife-torn southern republic of Azerbaijan there.

Another meeting had been scheduled for Monday outside local central committee headquarters.

Some 2,000 people shouting anti-Armenian slogans attended Sunday's rally after rumours that thousands of Armenians would be moved to Dushanbe.

Local authorities denied the rumours, but the demonstrators did not believe them, INTERFAX said.

Tadzhikstan borders on Afghanistan and during last month's clashes in Azerbaijan, Islamic resistance leaders called on Moslems of Central Asia to rise up against the Soviet leadership.

More than 100 people died, by official count, when Soviet troops stormed the Azerbaijan capital Baku on January 19 to quell fighting between Moslem Azeris and Christian Armenians.

Turkmen Supreme Soviet Appoints Officials

LD1102203790

[Editorial Report] Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian on 20 January on page one publishes reports on the first meeting of the 12th Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) Supreme Soviet held in the Supreme Soviet Meetings Hall in Ashkhabad from 18 to 19 January.

The Supreme Soviet apointed Kh. Akhmedov chairman of the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers in an open vote and instructed him to present proposals on the composition of the republic's government.

The session discussed and approved the following appointments to the Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers proposed by Akhmedov:

First deputy chairman	A. Charyyev
Deputy chairmen	Yu. K. Mogilvets
	B. Annayev
	T. Amangeldyyeva
	M. Razhapov
Gosplan chairman	M. Razhapov

The session also approved the following republican officials proposed by S.A. Niyazov, who chaired the session:

People's control committee chairman	V.S. Chertishchev
Supreme court chairman	N.M. Yusupov
Chief state arbiter	B.K. Nurmukhamedov

Two decisions of the Turkmen Supreme Soviet are also published, the first is on the creation of an economics committee chaired by Kerimov Khudaikuli Ovezovich, a deputy from the Neftazavodskiy Constituency in Chardzhou. The second is on the creation of a Foreign Affairs Committee chaired by Anilov Nurulla, a deputy from Ordzhonikidze Constituency in Chardzhou.

Uzbek Unemployment Figures Viewed

PM0702164990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 90 p 1

[Report by Ye. Anisimov: "Seven-Figure Unemployment"]

[Text] The speech delivered at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum by I.A. Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee, contained the following figure: Today about 1 million people in the republic have no work and the number of unemployed is continuing to rise. We asked A.A. Lebedev, president of the international association for the study of unemployment and homelessness, to comment on this fact:

"This is no news to us, especially as according to the assessments of our experts the number of unemployed in Uzbekistan is considerably higher. In general more than one government resolution has been adopted on the employment of the population in the Central Asian republics, but the effect.... There is only one way out—creating numerous small enterprises, cooperatives, joint ventures, leased enterprises, any enterprises, as long as they can resolve the problem of new jobs and with minimal expenditure from the state. Obviously the Uzbek leaders will try to ask for as much money as they can from the budget on the pretext of creating jobs. But this money will be taken from the taxpayer and is fraught with the danger of new complications.

"The USSR law on cooperatives was partly adopted in order to create a channel for providing jobs for the population laid off during the reforms. But overt opposition to the cooperatives from officials in practice is closing this channel. No resettling of people from regions with an excess of manpower, no capital investments, will put the situation right! Only a network of small enterprises using unskilled and female labor will do this, because in Central Asia it is the problem of female unemployment which is becoming particularly acute."

Uzbek Health Official Gives AIDS Figures

LD0502174790 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 14 Jan 90, p4

[Summary] In reply to a reader's letter, an Uzbek health official says he cannot reveal the identities of Uzbekistan's AIDS sufferers, but he does say that one HIV-positive man lives in Tashkent and an HIV-positive woman lives in Tashkent Oblast. Both are continuing with their normal jobs and have given a written guarantee that they are aware of the USSR Supreme Soviet decree on responsibility for deliberately spreading the desease.

He adds that there are now 287 people in Uzbekistan registered as suspected HIV-positive. Tests on them are continuing, but no final diagnosis has been reached.

Kirghiz Supreme Soviet To Convene 10 Feb

LD0502185690 Frunze Domestic Service in Kirghiz 1300 GMT 5 Feb 90

[Text] On convening the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees:

The Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium has resolved to convene the 12th extraordinary session of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation on 10 February, in the city of Frunze.

Signed by Akmatov, chairman of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. Mirzaliyeva, secretary of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium reports that the following issues will be put forward for the agenda of the 12th extraordinary session of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet: Defining more precisely the border between Batken rayon of Osh Oblast of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic and Isfar rayon of Leninabad Oblast of the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic; and confirming the border between the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic and the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic.

Developments in Transcaucasus Reported

City 'Relatively Peaceful'

NC1302091090 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Notice by military commandant of Baku City—read by announcer]

[Text] The situation in the republic's capital was relatively peaceful during the past day. The situation is being controlled by the law enforcement bodies. Mass violations of public laws and crimes have not been recorded.

Fifteen individuals were detained for violating the decree on the state of emergency, 14 for violating the passport regulations, and 52 for violating the curfew during the day. Nine vehicles were confiscated under the rules for checking and dispatching vehicles.

The situation in the (?Khatayi), [name indistinct], and Azizbekov Districts is improving. The state of emergency and the curfew were not violated in these districts during the past few days. I am grateful to the party and soviet organs, the staff of the field command headquarters, the employees of the district internal affairs organs, and the citizens for their effort to maintain public laws. I am confident that this process will be maintained.

However, the situation in the Kirov, Nasimi, and Oktyabr' Districts has remained tense. Many violations of the rules in the 26 Baku Commissars, Nizami, and Karadag districts have been recorded. The number of individuals who have been detained in these districts amounts to 60 percent of the overall number of people detained in the entire city.

Confidential appeals are made to us by telephone urging the withdrawal of the military units which are based in a number of sections in the schools. I inform you that, taking your appeals into consideration, the military units have been transferred to other buildings so that the schools can return to normal. Military troops continue to occupy temporarily the sports stadiums in schools No. 271 and 272. Regarding the question as to when the curfew will be lifted in Baku City, this will depend on our joint effort to stabilize the situation and restore normal life in the city.
[Signed] Lieutenant General Dubinyak, Military Commandant of Baku City.
[Dated] 10 February 1990

Inner City Tense, Rumors Spread

NC1302092890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 11 Feb 90

[Notice by military commandant's administration of Baku City—read by announcer]

[Text] The situation in the republic's capital remains peaceful, but the situation in the inner city continues to be tense. A number of individuals are spreading provocative rumors. Citizens are being urged not to heed the laws. Work is being interrupted through intimidation. Many families have informed us that they are not being paid, consequently facing financial difficulties. The loss suffered by the Baku City Soviet amounts to tens of millions of rubles. Each and every conscientious resident of Baku must think about the city's economy and call on people to work and avoid creating obstructions.

We inform you that 50 individuals were detained for violating the laws during the day. Five individuals were detained for violating the state of emergency, 20 for violating the passport regulations, and 25 for violating the curfew. Administrative organs have seized three firearms and various types of military equipment. Arms and military equipment have been taken from the shop [magaza] operated by the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy.

The matter is being investigated. Investigation of the theft of six short-barreled rifles and two training grenades from school No. 284 in Karadag district is continuing.

I remind all leading officials of the city's militia organs and establishments that they should place all arms and military equipment under control.

Tomorrow is a new day. I hope it will be organized and auspicious. The organs responsible for maintaining public order will provide security for the citizens. The daily activity of the citizens will be protected.

[Signed] The Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City

[Dated] 11 February 1990

12 Feb Situation Report

NC1302094490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Notice by military commandant's administration of Baku City—read by announcer]

[Text] The military commandant's administration of Baku City makes it known that the forces protecting the public laws have controlled the situation in the republic's capital during the past day. Mass violations of the public laws and crimes related to the interethnic discord were not recorded.

However, internal tension continues to prevail. Representatives of a number of hooligan groups continue to try to influence the people using blackmail and intimidation. Their criminal activities are disrupting stability, and cannot be tolerated by any conscientious resident of Baku. They must be isolated by the steadfast forces of the community. Measures will be taken against the provocateurs and against those who do not wish to [words indistinct] by the forces which support the laws.

We make it known that 52 individuals were detained for violating the laws. Nineteen of them were detained for violating the decree on the state of emergency, 18 for violating the passport regulations, and 19 for violating the curfew. Malikov, who is a resident of (?Nedzhadi) town in Kubanskiy Rayon, has been sent to prison for killing citizen [name indistinct] in January.

Arms are still being collected. Law enforcement agencies discovered and impounded a firearm, military equipment, R24,000, and a number of checks (?Rworth 8,000) in a car driven by (?Salih) Shahbazov. Shahbazov was sent to prison. An investigation is being conducted.

Comrades, rumors have been spread recently in the city to the effect that more robberies will be committed. Trying to disrupt the peaceful situation, hooligans are telephoning the Russian-speaking people to intimidate them and force them to leave the city. We urge the people to use the confidential telephone to give their telephone numbers to the commandant's headquarters in their areas whenever cases of [word indistinct] and intimidation occur. The military, administrative, and internal affairs organs will take measures to arrest such individuals.

We urge everyone not to be carried away by provocations and blackmail at night. These tactics serve those who wish to maintain the tense situation, getting carried away with them encourages those who wish to exploit shamelessly the [word indistinct] of the Azerbaijani people. It also creates an opportunity to disrupt the republic's democracy, sovereignty, and social order. Emerging from this situation is possible only through the unity of the progressive forces of the community, [words indistinct], and adherence to the peace process in the republic's capital.

[Signed] The Military Commandant's Administration of Baku City

[Dated] 12 February 1990

13 Feb Situation Report

NC1302075690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0430 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Notice issued by military commandant's administration of Baku City—read by announcer]

[Text] The military commandant's administration of Baku City makes it known that the operative situation in Baku City did not deteriorate last night. No mass violations of public laws were recorded. Two individuals were detained for committing crimes. Twelve individuals were detained for violating the decree on the state of emergency, 19 for violating the passport regulations, and 37 for violating the curfew.

[Signed] The military commandant's administration of Baku City.

Trains To Move 13 Feb

NC1302082690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] After a long interruption of service an agreement has been reached for the mutual movement of freight cars between Baku and Yerevan through Megri, (Cholpa), and Norashen. The movement of the trains will being at 1000 Moscow time on 13 February.

The leaderships of Azerbaijan and Armenia, the social organizations and work collectives of the two republics, the USSR Ministry of Railways, and the military commandant's headquarters have urged all the citizens in Armenia and Azerbaijan to facilitate the commencement of the movement of the trains in every way.

Normal work can be restored on this section of the railways within three or four days, but a high degree of caution and organization is required. Meanwhile, all citizens must understand that the trains are escorted by military servicemen, whose duty is to obstruct every development impeding the movement of the trains and to provide security for the locomotive brigade workers. It is the duty of everyone to help in this very important task of the state.

Nakhichevan Residents Mark Islamic Revolution Day

LD1202190490 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1630 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] According to the Central news Unit, the Muslim inhabitants of the towns and villages of the autonomous republic of Nakhichevan in Soviet Azerbaijan yesterday, simultaneously with the march of the border-region inhabitants of Julfa and Siyahrud, gathered on the other side of the Aras River chanting Islamic slogans, thus honoring the 11 February anniversary of the victory of the Islamic revolution in Iran.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Resumes Work 12 Feb

Arutyunyan Delivers Report

LD1202185690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Today, in Yerevan the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet resumed work, interrupted a month ago in connection with the escalation of events in Baku and areas bordering Azerbaijan. The deputies are examining matters related to amendments to the republic's constitution, and to the law on elections. Elections to the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet will take place on 20 May, while those to local soviets will take place on 8 July.

S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia, delivered a report on the situation in the republic. He reported that as a result of negotiations with the Azerbaijani side, agreement has been reached on opening through-traffic on the Nakhichevan sector of the Azerbaijan railway from 13 February.

Constitution, Law on Elections Examined

NC1302110190 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Report by unidentified correspondent on the resumption of the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] The session was opened by Deputy Grant Voskanyan, chairman of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, who proposed a one-minute silence in memory of the victims of the savage acts in Baku and in the Armenian-inhabited areas in Azerbaijan against innocent Armenians.

Artavart Gevorkyan, chairman of the deputies' committee of the Supreme Soviet, submitted a report.

Then the discussions on the Armenian Constitution [words indistinct] concerning revisions in the election law and on the elections of the people's deputies and on the limit of their authorities.

After a series of changes and revisions, the majority of the articles that were put to vote were ratified. Dear friends, more detailed reports about these articles will be published in the republican press.

(?After its noon break), Suren Arutyunyan, chairman of the republican council on the state of emergency and first chairman of the Armenian CP (Communist Party) Central Committee, briefed the session.

Following this, Suren Avetisyan, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet, presented a draft of a decision for study. The draft condemns the fresh wave of genocide in Baku and in the Armenian-inhabited areas in Azerbaijan and calls for a political assessment of this. The draft decision has been accepted by the Presidium of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

[Suren Avetisyan] The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet decision on the killings, violence, and other crimes perpetrated in January 1990 in Baku and in a number of other Armenian-inhabited areas in the Azerbaijan SSR: The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet points out that the tragic events in January 1990 in Baku and in a number of other Azerbaijan SSR areas seriously exacerbated the situation in the area. [Words indistinct] Armenians were killed, their houses savagely attacked, and violence, [word indistinct] and other acts of vandalism were perpetrated. There have been many cases of violence against Russians and other nationalities as well as against families of soldiers. The absence of a political assessment of the violence in Sumgait, assessing everything as the acts of hooligan and criminal elements, [word indistinct] their political and ideological [word indistinct], and ignoring the organized genocide, objectively helped to exacerbate the violence not only against the Armenian inhabitants of Azerbaijan, but against Russians, Jews, and other nationalities. The (?tension led to conflicts) between the border regions of the two republics.

Despite measures to improve the situation in the region, the situation continues to be grave and tense. The blockade of Armenia and of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] continues. The Gorisskiy-Stepanagert road is closed, and ties between the Armenian-inhabited villages in Khanlarskiy and Shaumyanskiy of the Armenian SSR and the Azerbaijan SSR have been severed. The (?exodus) of refugees from Azerbaijan (?is continuing). The Armenian SSR puts the number of these refugees at about 240,000 and this is further aggravating the already-difficult social-economic situation. The crimes perpetrated in Azerbaijan are creating [words indistinct] among the Armenians and among all the other peoples. They are exacerbating the antagonism between the two neighboring countries.

Numerous protests and (?proposals) are being received by the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet and by the republic's party and soviet bodies from the refugees, workers' collectives, public organizations, and individuals calling for the condemnation of the Armenian genocide in Azerbaijan and demanding that the organizers and perpetrators of these crimes be seriously punished.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet decides:

1. To condemn the violence against the Armenians in Baku and in the other Azerbaijan SSR rayons and to assess these as the continuation of the genocide of the Armenians;

2. To propose to the USSR Supreme Soviet to (?seriously punish) the organizers and perpetrators of the crimes in January 1990 in Baku and in the other rayons of the Azerbaijan SSR.

[Correspondent] A number of deputies and (?guests) made a series of proposals on how to make the [words indistinct] more concrete. It was decided to elect a deputies' commission of the Supreme Soviet which will consider the proposals on the draft decision and after making the necessary changes will present the draft decision to the session for ratification.

The deputies were also briefed on the election timetables of the Supreme Soviet and of the people's deputies' local soviets. It was decided that the Supreme Soviet elections be held on Sunday, 20 May 1990 and that the elections for the local soviets be held on Sunday, 8 July 1990.

A report was submitted on the situation in the region by Deputy Vladimir Movsisyan, chairman of the operational staff of the republic's council on the special situation, who said specifically:

[Vladimir Movsisyan] (?Currently) the most tense region is the Getashen sub-rayon where we have four Armenian villages—Getashen, Martunashen, Azat, and [name indistinct]. You know that we had many villages in Khanlarskiy Rayon which, after 22 November 1988 and after the evacuation of (Charbakhlu) village, 11 more villages were left [by their residents], as did the [name indistinct] village in Getashen sub-rayon. (?Thus) the situation in that region continues to be tense for two reasons. The people in Azat village also thought of leaving and to sell their houses. But during the past two years, (?through) Comrade (Karapanyan) of Getashen, we were able to (?convince) that these villages not be left. Today this (?wish) has become true for two reasons. The first is that flights are not being carried out during the past days and the second is that (?there are threats) that the Azerbaijanis will [word indistinct] these houses. We are considering alternative steps and I do not think it is necessary to comment on these under these conditions when today or tomorrow we can (?have a full report) on the situation. Our objective is that if the Armenians want to sell their houses and to leave Azat village, then these houses should be (?bought) by the Getashen Armenians [words indistinct]. (?Such steps are being taken). Our comrades are there now, but with their return tomorrow, I can report then on the outcome (?of their visit).

[Words indistinct] for a few days with the chairman of the Khanlarskiy [word indistinct] committee so that these houses will be [word indistinct], but on the basis of information until today there are still no [words indistinct]. It is understandable that there are people who do not want to live under those conditions and want to sell their houses [words indistinct]. But we repeat that both we and the representatives of informal organizations are doing everything we can to [word indistinct] so that the said village will not be (?resettled). If this happens, the same will happen in [word indistinct] Getashen and (?other areas). Thus, the situation is extremely tense. I (?do not want to go) into all the details. But I assure you that we have been working for two years already on this, and we have (?achieved something) and (?hope that soon) these problems will be solved.

The other [word indistinct] is the representatives of the army who are in Getashen and in Azat villages and who are [words indistinct] and we have reached an agreement [words indistinct] and people can go there freely. We are working toward that.

As far as other problems are concerned, I would like to say that there were [words indistinct] four flights during the past three days. These flights (?have now) stopped, but we are taking steps to have them reinstated. In paallel, (?there are two other issues). The first is that the transport link from Shaumyanskiy to Getashen has been re-established, and the (?second) is that in [name indistinct] village where the incidents took place, the troops are [words indistinct] and are able to facilitate the transport of cargo from Shaumyanskiy to Getashen. We have also reached an agreement to use trucks to send foodstuff to Stepanakert. Defense Minister Yazov has assigned [words indistinct] to facilitate the transfer of cargo that we are to send from Stepanakert to Shaumyanskiy and to Getashen. These issues are [words indistinct]. But the situation continues to be tense.

I would also like to report on two other issues [words indistinct]. The first is on the Gorisskiy-Lachin-Stepanakert route and the second is on the situation stemming from this.

The negotiations have already reached such a level that the other side has said that they can allow only [word indistinct] cars and buses. We have spoken about all cars [words indistinct] and trucks so that we can carry (?fuel). The other issue concerning roads—and yesterday I went to Vardenis to inspect the sub-rayon—is that they have said that there should be a route through Martakert toward Azerbaijan. We have proposed that this route not only [words indistinct] go to Azerbaijan through Martakert but also to come to [name indistinct] through Martakert. Negotiations on these have already reached a certain level. There are no clarifications, but [words indistinct].

I would like to say a few words about the Armenian-inhabited areas in [name indistinct] because the situation there, too, is tense and is under inspection. We have established a [word indistinct] link between Noyemberyanskiy and these villages. Our [words indistinct] and relations are [words indistinct]. We are striving to make the roads operational between these villages. This is a very grave problem. We have proposed three roads [words indistinct]. The first is Kalininskiy's Privolnyy-[name indistinct] road. The second is the Shamlu-(Govsep)-[name indistinct] road. The third is the Tumanyan-Riga autoroute. We are already trying to make these three roads operational (?within this year) so that the Armenian-inhabited villages of [name indistinct] rayon can have links with Armenia.

[Correspondent] Deputies Sarkis Muradyan, Karlen Galadyan, and Ashot Manucharyan as well as USSR People's Deputies Mikhail Suslov and Oleg Lobov, and (Nora Hakopyan), chairman of Armenian Transport, expressed their views on these issues. A deputies' commission was formed on the issue which will take into consideration the proposals that were made and will present a report to the session tomorrow.

Estonian Government Meets 30 Jan

LD0802093190 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 90

[Excerpt] [Announcer] First of all, information about today's government session. Today's session of the Estonian Government was rich in decisions. Several points dealt with the protection of order. The Estonian concept of law-and-order protection won the approval of the government.

A resolution was adopted to set up an Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, which will be subordinated to the republican government. The draft contact between the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Government and the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs concerning mutual relations was approved in principle. An initiative group was set up: It is tasked with presenting the government a draft law on the Estonian Union for Protecting Order by 1 March.

It was agreed that Haapsalu Rayon will become Laane district; Paide Rayon will become Jarva district; and that Orissaare village soviet will be created within Saare district.

Imports and exports were discussed. The import-export permits board, lists of goods under restrictions, construction of border checkpoints, the draft Estonian law on customs, setting up an Estonian customs board—all these issues need to be resolved quickly.

The self-managing Estonia wages policy requires that workers's interests are protected. The minimum hourly rates for workers, and professionals' salaries (?must become known). These were approved by the government. The minimum hourly rate now exceeds the valid previous rate by nearly one-third. The new minimum rates are compulsory for enterprises, effective 1 January 1991. [passage omitted]

Committee for 'Soviet Power' Formed in Estonia

LD0602132690 Moscow World Service in Russian 1040 GMT 6 Feb 90

[From the "Interfax" feature of the "Soviet Day by Day" program]

[Text] A committee to defend Soviet power and civil rights has been formed in Estonia by a group of people's deputies from the towns of Tallinn, Kohtla-Jarva, Narva, and Sillamae, an Interfax correspondent reports. The committee consists of 25 people. It is headed by Vladimir Yarovoy, general director of one of the industrial enterprises. The committee has adopted a declaration, sent to the presidium of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium. It expresses no confidence in the presidium of the Estonian legislature. The document says that the committee is taking upon itself the function of coordinator of authorities in various centers of population.

Toompea Meeting Discusses Estonia's Future

LD0602113690 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 5 Feb 90

[Excerpt] [Announcer] A meeting took place on Toompea [seat of government] today, at the invitation of the Foreign Ministry, in order to find possible channels which would lead us more swiftly to international recognition. Represented were both the Estonian Government and the Chief Committee of Citizens of the Republic of Estonia, the Estonian People's Front [words indistinct] organizations, town governments of Tartu and Parnu, and Tallinn [words indistinct]. The discussion was chaired by the foreign minister Arnold Green. [indistinct passage omitted]

Estonian Party Fails To Produce Congress Documents

PM1202122990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Estonian Communist Party Conference"]

[Text] Tallinn, 10 Feb—The Estonian Communist Party conference, which opened yesterday, continued its work in Tallinn today. The decision to hold the conference was adopted at the 16th Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum in January of this year. The 368 delegates, representing hundreds of thousands of Estonian communists, are faced with drawing up the ideological and organizational bases for holding the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress, scheduled for 23 March.

Points connected with the elaboration of draft rules and program party documents and with a historical evaluation of the Estonian Communist Party's activity were also on the conference agenda.

The second day was entirely devoted to discussing two alternative draft program documents for the Estonian Communist Party. The advocates of one are proposing to implement a radical renewal of the party, while the advocates of the other believe that that it is enough to elaborate a program that does not violate the bases of the CPSU's unity. The sides were not able to come to a full agreement on, or to elaborate, a document which could be submitted for discussion by the delegates at the Estonian Communist Party Congress. They need help from all members of the republican organization.

The resolution adopted on the procedure for holding an intraparty debate to discuss program documents instructs the republic party organizations to hold a precongress discussion and elaborate proposals aimed at guaranteeing the Estonian Communist Party's ability to function.

The conference instructed the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau to create a working group whose task will include preparing the appropriate material for the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress.

With this, the conference concluded its work.

Common Platform Difficult for Estonian Communists

PM1202162790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Feb 90 First Edition p 1

[Telephone dispatch by Captain Third Rank A. Orlov: "Estonia: Is Estonian Communist Party at Crossroads?"]

[Text] The situation in Estonia today looks like this: Two men embarked on a long and very difficult journey together came to a fork in the road and had a desperate argument about which road to take. That is how one of the pickets standing outside the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee building on the day the Estonian Communist Party conference started work expressively set out his idea of the recent political events in the republic. The majority of the pickets were representatives of Inter-Movement, that is, of the non-Estonian speaking population: The Estonians only came here to find out what demands were being made, and they disputed them for many reasons.

Yes, the essence of the processes taking place in all strata of society here is actually in the choice of the republic's path from now on. And a large proportion of the people have already made the choice. It was expressed back on 2 February at the republic meeting of Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] peoples' deputies at all levels—autonomy and secession from the USSR. Seemingly it is only a question of their explaining themselves as tactfully as possible to their "fellow travelers." And it was noted at the Estonian Communist Party conference, which brought together 868 deputies, that "restoring the autonomy" of Estonia is an extremely difficult and contradictory process which demands legal foundations as well as a firm economic and social base.

The conference is proceeding with difficulty. The delegates were given two reports on each of the questions submitted—on the Estonian Communist Party program and rules, and on preparation for the 20th Congress. This is a phenomenon as new, as far as one can tell, to the Estonian Communist Party as it is to the CPSU.

V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, made the introductory speech on the party's position and its role and place in society in conditions of a genuinely developing multiparty system.

Supplementary reports were given by Ya. Allik, first secretary of Vilyandiskiy Estonian Communist Party Rayon Committee; V. Kovtun, deputy secretary of the Estonian Maritime Steamship Company party committee; E. Cherevashko, Estonian SSR minister; G. Israelyan, chief of Tallinn Estonian Communist Party City Committee organizational department; and Kh. Roots and L. Annus, Estonian Communist Party Central Committee inspectors. The opinions of these speakers on the future of the Estonian Communist Party were in many respects conflicting. However, both they and the other speakers were agreed on one thing: The resolution of the real problems facing Estonia requires united action from CPSU members representing the various nationalities.

As regards the future of the Estonian Communist Party, a few options were outlined (they are also being discussed in the republic): to suspend the Estonian Communist Party's activity, restore the Estonian Communist Party's autonomy; to form a new Communist Party on the basis of the Estonian Communist Party; or to create a totally new party, most probably a party of Estonian democratic reform.

It is undoubtedly difficult to elaborate a common platform on the basis of all this. The question of the Estonian Communist Party's future was also one of the fundamental questions at the press conference held after the first day of the conference's work. One of the journalists asked the question: How many communist parties will there be in the republic by the end of the first year of autonomy? The press conference leaders' answers varied considerably.

"I believe that there will be one communist party," V. Malkovskiy, first secretary of Narva Estonian Communist Party City Committee, declared.

E. Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, expressed this view:

"There will be one independent Estonian Communist Party and another communist party based on the CPSU platform."

The conference delegates continued their work Saturday.

'Free Estonia' Association Defines Goals

90UN0878A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 25 Jan 90 p 1

[Statement of goals issued by "Free Estonia" Democratic Electoral Alliance; place, date not given]

[Text] And once again Estonia is at a decisive stage—a half-century after the fatal events of June 1940 the first free elections to the highest organ of power are to be held. We are freeing ourselves of fear, and the people's aspiration to independence has been honestly expressed.

What is the current situation?

Estonia today is experiencing one of the biggest recessions in its history. We lack independence, a civil society and democracy, an environment worthy of man, and much else that makes life worthwhile. Social uncertainty, economic difficulties, the ecological crisis, rising crime, the low living standard, and national tensions.... The list of our problems is endless, nonetheless, we can overcome them if we act together.

The events of the past two years in Estonia and the other Baltic republics and the hurricane which has swept over East Europe indicate unequivocally that the political regimes and an economic system forcibly imposed before and after World War II on the peoples of Central and East Europe have been blind alleys of history.

An awakening and the liberation of the nations has begun in the Soviet Union, which has today assumed historical proportions.

An Electoral Alliance—for what?

A solution of Estonia's problems knows no simple prescriptions. We are coming from a totalitarian system, wherein participating in public life was possible only as a member of the party. For this reason the majority of today's politicians enjoying the support of the people are members of the Estonian Communist Party. Naturally, we part company with the members of the Estonian Communist Party and nonparty persons who have soiled their hands by participating in Stalin's crimes, consciously contributing to the pursuit in Estonia of imperial policy and impeding the development of Estonian culture.

Estonia already has dozens of groupings laying claim to be independent parties, nonetheless, the upcoming elections will inevitably come down to a choice of personalities. Almost none of these groupings has real achievements to its credit, and the emphasis is being put on the idea of the future. Thus the voters may make their choice between candidates only on the basis of the previous conduct of each individual. In order to facilitate the choice and avoid at a crucial stage the comminution of the political forces we consider it correct for the candidates for deputy to unite in electoral alliances. Estonia needs cooperation and dependability, and not a struggle for a monopoly of power and one's sole truth. These alliances could help determine the possible outlines of future parties and give politicians an idea of the correspondence of their initial positions to the people's wishes. In this way the people could help shape future parties. The elections should not weaken but, on the contrary, strengthen the united front of the Estonian people. After all, the principal character at the elections is not this candidate for deputy or the other but the people themselves expressing their wishes and good sense.

The main aim is a free Estonia!

Each people wishes to be themselves, organize life as they see fit and decide their own fate. Our greatest resource is the will of the people, who are increasingly distinctly and loudly declaring their aspiration to an Estonian Republic. It is the duty of politicians to realize this aspiration. But restoring the Estonian Republic only on an ideological basis and with a few hasty political decisions is impossible. We will make a political decision in any event. For genuine independence, however, it will be necessary to create the economic, social, and political prerequisites. Responsibility to the people does not allow us to employ power politics. Estonia is dependent currently on raw material and fuel supplied from the Union. Rash action would unite considerable numbers of the Russian community around politicians with great-power thinking and would inevitably drive us into a difficult and protracted crisis. Only by building up our readiness for independence can we embark on the path toward genuine independence.

Together with this Estonia should enter the common European home as a viable state, not remaining as the outlying region of any political and economic system. At the same time, however, Estonia's independence is guaranteed by good-neighbor relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of the 1920 Tartu peace treaty.

The achievement of independence will require understanding on the part of non-Estonians. The natural prerequisite of such an attitude is the solution of nationality problems, proceeding from generally recognized human rights. We acknowledge the truth that the vast majority of nonindigenous inhabitants of Estonia are not personally responsible for the violence done to the Estonian people. We will therefore seek a worthy future for all, regardless of whether a person declares a desire to become a citizen of Estonia or remains a citizen of another state.

Actual policy, reforms.

A democratic political system, consistent economic reforms, respect for human rights and the cooperation of all democratic forces guarantee a peaceful solution en route to a civil society and the creation of an economy based on a diversity of forms of ownership and enterprise. We should take advantage of our geopolitical location between East and West.

Progress will be all the stronger, the better we are able to smooth over the confrontation of different interests. This is not only a matter for electoral alliances, parties, the parliament, or the government. Important reforms may be implemented only when they are supported by the people. For this reason we link our hopes not only with the reforms but with an explanation of the problems in the form of a candid dialogue.

Estonian society is small, and for this reason the question of allies is important to all of us. Together with Lithuania and Latvia, other restructuring forces in the Union are our natural allies. Just as we have no alternative to independence, so there is in the Union now no alternative to Gorbachev.

Of course, we will in our aspiration to independence rely on the world democratic community also.

"Free Estonia" supports all movements, organizations, and parties which have arrived at a recognition of the need for profound economic, social, and political reforms and offers cooperation to all political forces advocating the creation of an independent and democratic Estonian Republic. The nucleus of such an alliance is the joint work of center forces. What is important for us is a solution of the problems, not their evaluation from right or left.

The future of the Estonian people lies before us. So let us unite our forces in the name of the future and let us view as our goal unity, and not political confrontation, from which no one benefits. Let us have faith in what we believe in—our future, our motherland, and one another!

[Signed] Kh. Aben, Ya. Allik, K. Khallik, Ya. Kaarma, S. Kallas, T. Kork, M. Myuyur, R. Otsason, A. Raukas, Ya. Salumets, T. Sildam, M. Titma, I. Toome, Yu. Voorglayd.

Deputies' Group To Fight for 'Existing' Laws

PM0702104990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Leonid Levitskiy report: "Committee Expresses Lack of Confidence"]

[Text] Tallinn—The declaration adopted by the Estonian Assembly of People's Deputies on the question of state independence has exacerbated the political and interethnic contradictions in the republic. In response to the declaration's adoption people's deputies from Narva, Kokhtla-Yarve, Sillamyae, and Tallinn have elected a Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power and Civil Rights in Estonia. Its chairman is USSR People's Deputy V. Yarovoy, and its deputy chairmen are L. Annus and V. Malkovskiy, members of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. A report published by the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA stresses: "The committee's main aim is to protect the political and economic rights of Soviet citizens as part of the renewed Soviet federation or through the creation of a new state territorial entity."

A statement by the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium has also been published. It notes that for a long time the Supreme Soviet Presidium, in adopting decisions, has pointedly ignored the interests of the Russian-speaking population and the opinions of the "For Equal Rights" deputies' group that represents it on the Supreme Soviet. An example of this, the committee believes, is the declaration on Estonian statehood aimed at secession from the USSR.

The statement says: In this connection the committee expresses its lack of confidence in the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and takes on itself the functions of coordinating legal authority in cities, rayons, and other population centers which recognize its right to implement existing USSR and Estonian SSR legislation. At the same time, we declare that we do not recognize a single act of legislation adopted since 16 November 1988 in violation of civil rights and the USSR Constitution, and we announce a campaign of civil disobedience with respect to the application of such legislation

We will learn the reaction of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium in the next few days. Unfortunately, as we have already seen for ourselves on a number of occasions, the prestige and power of union and republic enactments has been severely undermined in Estonia. Each side refers merely to those acts which are advantageous to it. Hence the instability and lack of confidence in the future. Rallies and meetings have begun in labor collectives, at which the declaration on the question of Estonian state independence and the declaration of the group of people's deputies from Tallinn and the cities of northeast Estonia are being discussed.

70 Percent of Latvian Communists Favor CPSU Ties

LD0702143390 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Text] Riga LATINFORM-TASS February 7 TASS—Seventy five per cent of Riga communists believe that the Latvian Communist Party should remain part of the Soviet Communist Party, according to results of a public opinion poll carried out by the public opinion service Socioniks in Riga. The poll covered a thousand communists from different party organisations.

Most respondents favoured the expansion of the sovereign rights of the republican party organisation. 22.4 per cent opted for the creation of a communist party of Latvia independent of the CPSU.

Every second respondent was sure that a decision of the congress of the Latvian Communist Party to quit the Soviet Communist Party could increase social and interethnic tension in society and lead to the destabilisation of the balance of forces in the international arena and other unfavourable consequences.

Only 10.5 per cent of respondents believe it is possible to determine the status of the Latvian Communist Party at its congress, as was earlier done in Lithuania. Every second respondent thought that a referendum on this issue should be held to reveal the opinion of all communists.

Latvian Group on Independence by Legislative Means

PM0902154390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Irina Litvinova dispatch under the rubric "Direct Link. IZVESTIYA own correspondents at the teleprinter": "Electoral Union Formed"]

[Text] Riga—An intense electoral campaign is continuing in Latvia. It is 10 days until the final date when republic Supreme Soviet candidate deputies can be nominated.

The initiators of the electoral union "For a Latvian State and for the Freedom of the Individual" made an appeal to the population. This appeal was signed by A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium; V. Bresis, chairman of the Council of Ministers; A. Kauls, chairman of the Union of Agricultural Workers; R. Pauls, minister of culture; the writer Ya. Peters; and other cultural workers, journalists, and economists well known in the republic.

The electoral union made an appeal that honest, fair, and, most importantly, hard-working people be elected to parliament. The main criterion for election is a person's devotion to the cause of renewing Latvia. "Let the organization you belong to or the post you hold be left to the formalists," the appeal says. The path to an independent state is an aim that the new parliament must achieve by legislative means. The republic needs stability and cooperation and not a struggle for the monopoly of power and being exclusively right. Economic preconditions must be created in order to achieve real sovereignty for the state and for the individual. "No one from outside will include us again in the European economic and cultural system," the authors of the appeal say. "In the building of the future, which will be occupied by the common European home, there will be no special 'room' reserved for Latvia."

The electoral union "For a Latvian State and for Freedom of the Individual" has announced that it supports candidate deputies who represent the movements, parties, and organizations that propose constructive cooperation to all people who are capable of acting responsibly.

Latvian Komsomol Rejects Disbandment

PM0702164590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 3 Feb 90 p 1

[Report by own correspondent K. Markaryan under the "Current Feature" rubric: "Latvia: The Komsomol Remains"]

[Text] Riga—A few days before the Latvian Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] congress there were rumors circulating about its virtual disbandment, or at least its irrevocable separation from the All-Union Komsomol, with a complete change of name for the republic youth organization.

Various groupings and factions have aspired to the leading role among young people. There have even been attempts to create an interim Komsomol organization called "Smena" [the replacement] and a republic youth sejm which would include representatives of all parties and movements. There have been other proposals too. For example, at the beginning of last December Riga's Moskovskiy Rayon Komsomol report and election conference, with its rayon committee first secretary A. Belogorskiy at its head, adopted a majority decision that the Komsomol should disband. And Riga's Moskovskiy Rayon is, incidentally, one of the Latvian capital's largest and most multinational rayons, so the idea of self-dissolution bore no national tinge from the outset.

A few figures: In two-to-three years the strength of the Latvian Komsomol has declined by almost 100,000, which represents one-third of the republic Komsomol organization. Some 60,000 of them have left the Komsomol for reasons of age and almost 15,000 have been expelled from the organization, 10,000 in the last year alone. The number of those being admitted into the Komsomol is also decreasing. In 1989 the Komsomol ranks were swelled by only 2,148 young men and women, which is almost 8,000 fewer than a year earlier. There are now slightly over 200,000 people in the Latvian Komsomol.

Here are data obtained from recent polls of young people. It is interesting that "public activeness," "collectivism," and a "high level of ideological commitment and internationalism" come bottom (out of 24 places) in the ranking of life values. "Common human qualities," "independence," and "inner harmony" got young people's top rating.

The crisis of ideas is accompanied by a mass exodus from the Komsomol. The holes in the ship are growing larger and it is making increasingly heavy weather. The Komsomol is gradually falling apart, as Ivars Priyeditis, former first secretary of the Latvian Komsomol Central Committee, said in his progress report. Former, because he has submitted his resignation after 10 years of work in the Komsomol, four of them as head of the republic organization. He has now decided to leave and perhaps, as he said, return to his former specialization as an engineer.

Let us note that Ivars is a respected man, and not just in the republic. You can in no way describe him as a functionary carving out the usual Komsomol career enjoyed by many. On the contrary, his style of thinking and working is closer perhaps to the members of informal groups in our current understanding rather than members of the apparatus. Ivars has repeatedly spoken boldly and honestly both in his own republic and from the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee plenum rostrum. His decision therefore also constitutes an act, an honest act which wins respect above all.

High drama in an organization is also high drama for its leader. True, the same Priyeditis does advise us not to take what is happening so sensitively: "Was it normal for a 300,000-strong sociostate youth conglomerate to operate in a country with a population of 2.5 million?"

It is also interesting that virtually all the young people from the republic's towns and villages have advocated the formation of a Latvian youth organization and a union of organizations. In other words, an objective need to unite and coordinate forces does exist.

One group of students has, however, demanded, for example, that the Komsomol be disbanded and that its property be divided or handed over altogether to the state bureaucracy. It has even presented its very own platform and action program. Razing to the ground again, and what then?

But there was no split at the congress. Although the Latvian Komsomol's new draft statutes and program did cause numerous disputes. Particularly those paragraphs which speak about relations with the Communist Party and views on Marxist-Leninist teaching. The paragraph on Marxism was eventually deleted, as was the paragraph on "cooperation with the Latvian Communist Party on the basis of ideological unity." The Latvian Komsomol has acquired the status of an autonomous sociopolitical youth organization. Henceforth it belongs to the All-Union Komsomol as an organization that enjoys the right to determine on its own all the norms of its own life inside the league, except for the provisions of the All-Union Komsomol Statutes as applied to its central organs.

Thus, the Latvian Komsomol has preserved itself and its own identity (even if the latter has noticeably changed of late). What is the upshot? Above all the Latvian Komsomol has upheld its right to speak on behalf of the majority of the republic's youth and the members of its own organization and to take part in the solution of their problems at state level, particularly as the congress discussed and adopted the concept of republic state youth policy.

At the same time the congress instructed the republic Komsomol Central Committee to elaborate a mechanism for creating new youth organizations in the light of the opinion of delegates who do not recognize the adopted program and statutes. Among other important decisions, delegates adopted a resolution on alternative service in the ranks of the Soviet Army and a resolution "On Komsomol Press Publications." The latter resolves, in particular, to double editorial offices' wages fund and to triple the fund of royalties per issue of publication by utilizing profit at the youth press' disposal.

I think that Komsomol workers and Komsomol journalists in other regions of the country will have quite a few questions to ask in this regard. The KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondents' center in Riga is ready to go back to this decision and answer your questions in greater detail. As it is other questions too, by the way. The correspondents' center telephone number in Riga is 24-77-58.

The congress is over. Ya. Urbanovich, new first secretary of the Latvian Komsomol Central Committee, and the really young A. Markots (barely 20), new Central Committee secretary in charge of ideology, have started their jobs. Here are a few observations communicated by V. Mironenko, first secretary of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee, during a recess between congress sessions.

"What is happening at the Latvian Komsomol members' forum is no surprise to me. I am pretty well informed about the situation in the republic Komsomol, whose ranks contain a large number of people of the most diverse views. What's happening here is normal. Of course, not a single political organization has yet been built in the world on federative principles. But it must be borne in mind that this is a youth organization. By the way, some of the ideas and provisions contained in the republic statutes could be beneficially utilized in the new all-union statutes that are in preparation. I am sure that the All-Union Komsomol, like the republic Komsomol, does have a future if all of us show enough responsibility to exploit our strong points—discarding, obviously, our weak ones—and transform it into an organization capable of operating in the conditions of a democratic, rule-of-law, socialist state. And I think that the following requirement—a striving for unity in diversity—should serve as our basic guideline here."

The 21st All-Union Komsomol Congress lies ahead. Only time will tell whether our league will renew itself and really remain a defender of young people's rights.

But it is clear right now that the 21st All-Union Congress will have to answer the same questions as were asked at the Komsomol Congress in Riga. And it will have to try to answer them on its own without giving in to pressure—from the left or the right. That also requires courage.

Latvian Tour Operator Claims Autonomy

PM0902102390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Irina Litvinova report from Riga: "Hard Times for Tourism"]

[Text] Latvia's "Teviya" ("Fatherland") tourist association is the new name for the former republic council for tourism and excursions. It is not just the name that has changed, the leaders who changed the organization's name reported at a press conference for journalists. A meeting of authorized labor collectives adopted a decision on autonomous status independent of the center—in this case the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions]. From now on it will pay taxes only to the republic. The Latvian organizers claimed that they had repeatedly informed the AUCCTU of their intention to go independent. The answer was silence, which had persisted until now. Literally on the eve of the press conference the association unanimously adopted the text of an appeal demanding an answer to its questions as an ultimatum.

"The main problem," association chairman Y. Seya said, "is linked with ownership, of course. Moscow believes that Latvian tourist centers are owned by all-union trade unions. We are showing that they are owned by the republic's trade unions. It is proposed to base relations henceforth on a contractual footing. We have developed a concept for our future activity with similar organizations in Lithuania and Estonia. Independence will save us from paying money into the common pot. This is money which will stay in the republic and be used to strengthen our material base, restore monuments, and provide better facilities."

Tourism in Latvia is currently experiencing hard times. Whereas last January 100 percent of the tours were running, the figure today is only 60 percent. Clearly, the sights of Riga and Latvia's other venues have not lost their attraction. Tourism is also indirectly affected by the political situation in the region and by ill-considered economic decisions—for instance, the introduction of a proof-of-identity requirement for people who want to make purchases in the republic. Since 1 January travel passes to Riga have been returned virtually in bundles. Losses for 1989 stand at R3 million.

The association will take its first steps toward autonomy in the very near future.

Latvian Farmers Establish Association

LD1002071890 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 9 Feb 90

[Text] Riga February 9 TASS—by Latinform—TASS correspondent Tatyana Kovalskaya:

When Oskar Griegs, a 47-year-old Latvian peasant, came to Riga to take part in a meeting of Latvian and Swedish farmers, he little thought of becoming president. As of today, Griegs heads an association of Latvian farmers set up during the meeting to unite the Republic's more than 4,000 independent farmsteads.

This is the way Griegs sees it: "The movement of Latvian farmers is developing turbulently. Locks were opened by the republican law on farmsteads, unique in the Soviet Union. There were 2,000 of us last year, we are now 4,000 and the number is expected to reach 7,000 by the year's end.

"But only one-third of the present 4,000 farmers have all the required equipment for independent farming. Our visiting colleagues from the Swedish Farmer Federation have agreed to help us out by supplying equipment and consultations and sharing their own experience".

A protocol on cooperation with the Swedish Federation was drawn up and signed by representatives of both organisations as soon as formal and organisational hindrances were removed. The protocol stipulated conditions for supplies to Latvia of small tractors and other equipment. The first shipment is expected to arrive in time for the spring field work.

"We did not expect such precipitous developments," said Karlos Sandskaer, the Swedish Federation's foreign relations chief. "At best we hoped to have a protocol signed by the end of this year. It was a pleasant surprise that perestroyka is not only economic reform but a weapon in the struggle against bureaucracy".

Live Relay of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet 12 Feb

LD1202232690

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0800 GMT on 12 February carries a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session being held in Vilnius. The session is chaired by Lionginas Sepetys. Before the start of the session, an announcer says that there are protestors outside the Supreme Soviet building with signs demanding help for families with many children and "punishment for Eismuntas," the republican KGB chairman.

After discussion of a draft law on the militia, Deputy Jonas Misiunas delivers a report on the draft law on court procedures and the status of judges in the republic. He states that the new law will require introducing some changes in the Constitution. The new draft law stresses the need to defend citizens' rights and the importance of citizens being equal as far as the republic's laws are concerned. In important cases a jury will be used. A person's guilt must be proved, he says, those accused do not need to prove their innocence, a person is innocent until his crime is proved. The term people's judge is to be abolished by removing the word people's and courts will be independent, Misiunas concludes

After discussion, a commission to deal with this draft law is approved and the session takes a break for 20 minutes.

Sepetys reopens the session at 1000 GMT and the debates on the republic's legal system and the status of the judges continue.

A vote on this draft law is to be taken later.

At 1040 GMT amendments to the draft law on the foundations of ownership in the republic are put to vote. All amendments pass by a majority of votes. The entire draft law passes with 240 votes in favor and five abstentions. Nobody votes against the draft law on ownership.

Following the vote, Kazimierz Prunskiene speaks on implementaion of the new law: "Esteemed parliament, first of all I would like to congratulate you and us all, as well as the whole of Lithuania on the occasion of adopting such a basic law which opens the way to a basically different economic system and its establishment in Lithuania."

"In presenting this draft law," Prunskiene says, "I stated briefly that this law was not directly effective and automatically could not propose specifically how to carry out the sale of state property, so that it becomes privately owned." "There are at present some draft documents. For instance, the Ministry of Finance has made proposals on how to sell immovable property to private persons and cooperatives."

Prunskiene continues: "I think it is clear to everyone that although the law comes into force in an ordinary way, we are not introducing any dates. The new economic system does not start functioning automatically and essentially nothing is changing in the sphere of economic relations. The implementation of the ownership law is linked with adopting the bank law, introducing a national currency and others factors." He concludes by saying the problems will be discussed by the economic reform commission and society as a whole.

After an hour and a half break the session resumes at 1300 GMT. Deputy Romualdas Ozolas speaks on the implementation of the decision adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet on 7 December, 1989 concerning protecting the Lithuanian archives.

Ozolas states: "As you remember we adopted a decision on 7 December of last year on the protection of state and department archives. It stated that until the adoption of the law on archives any destruction or removal of the archives was forbidden. Wishing to ensure that the archives were safe, on 19 January of this year, together with Deputy Kazimieras Motieka, I went to the archives of the State Security Committee."

Ozolas describes his visit to the archives of the Lithuanian KGB. He found that many boxes on shelves were empty and that there were empty boxes stacked up in corridors and passages. Nobody could explain where the case files had gone. Ozolas says, and adds that General Eismuntas explained the destruction of files with various reasons such as the insignificance of certain cases.

"The destruction of files continues methodically. The documents are being destroyed in the committee's yard [passage indistinct] then they are taken as waste paper to the Grigiskes paper factory. The chairman of the State Security Committee, Comrade Eismuntas, and his deputy, Comrade Baltinas, do not consider changing their policy in this matter. Therefore, I propose, first of all, to solve the problem of the committee's leadership. I think that, indeed, Comrade Eismuntas cannot but obey Moscow's instructions, as he has stated at the Supreme Soviet presidium. [sentence indistinct] Of course, it is possible and essential to make constitutional amendments and transfer the State Security Committee from the union-republican subordination to the republican subordination. But, to my mind, even then the question concerning the chairman's person remains. This is why:

On 23 January, at 11 o'clock in the morning, five vehicles left the State Security Committee. One of them was pulling a trailer. Three of them were military vehicles. [sentence indistinct] Thus, one of the greatest plunders of the archives of the Lithuanian State Security Committee was committed. [passage indistinct]" Ozolas continues: "I propose that, first, a state commission be set up to establish the scope of the destruction and removal of the archives. Second, negotiations should be started with the USSR State Security Committee on the (?return of these archives). [passage containing third point indistinct] Fourth, that the Council of Ministers be instructed to examine the abolition of the State Security Committee as (?union-subordinate)."

Comrade Baltinas, deputy chief of the republican KGB denies all the allegations and says that archives are not being destroyed. Baltinas says that some allegations and accusations made by Deputy Genzelis are unfounded. For example, the accusation that the KGB is fabricating evidence in cases against dissidents is not true; the KGB simply implements the imperfect laws of stagnation.

Baltinas admits that there is a lack of openness and restructuring was taking place in the republican KGB but contends that much has been done in other spheres, such as the campaign against smuggling.

Deputy Genzelis asks what KGB officers today think about the imprisonment of dissidents who were innocent. Baltinas says that now they are sorry.

Baltinas is asked what has the KGB done to find out who is opening and reading people's letters from abroad. The deputy KGB chief says that the KGB does not have anything to do with this. Baltinas goes on to say that if deputies want to control the work of the KGB in this republic the status of the KGB has to be changed first. At present the KGB is subbordinated to the all-union committee level.

A decision is adopted to form a commission to prepare a draft law on the protection of archives which will later be presented to the session through the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The draft law on archives is discussed.

After another 20-minute break the draft law on the agriculture code is debated. A vote is taken on the draft law on the agriculture code in its present form before editing the draft law had been supported by 112 deputies; in this vote it is supported by only 70 deputies and does not pass.

The session returns to the draft law on self-government.

Reports on legal aspects of the draft law and on the first and second parts of the draft are presented. Following debate, a vote is taken on the draft law on self-government; 235 deputies vote in favor so the law passes unanimously.

The law is to come into force after the election when reorganization of local government in the republic will begin.

Mecys Laurinkus then reads a statement by deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet from Lithuania concerning the events of 1940 in Lithuania asking Gorbachev to start negotiations concerning the reinstatement of Lithuania's independence at the USSR Supreme Soviet. Mecys Laurinkus also reads a statement which says that the session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet supports the above statement.

Debates follow on the issue. Some deputies say that a similar decision has already been made by this session.

Deputy Sabutis says that although this question can be solved right away, he proposes the session wait for the chairman of the Supreme Soviet to return from Moscow and then continue the discussion. At this point, reception becomes unmonitorable.

Lithuanian Parliament Legalizes Private Property

LD1302015390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 12 February. (TASS)—The law "On the Fundamentals of Property" has been adopted at the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet session which has resumed its work here. Along with the existing state and collective forms of property it legalizes private property in this Soviet Baltic republic.

Under the new law, all forms of property in Lithuania not banned by law are permitted, namely: private property, the property of the family, of the peasant farm, of cooperatives, of joint stock companies, economic associations, public organizations, local self-governments, the state, joint enterprises of Lithuania with other states, and so on." [quotation mark as received]

The law guarantees "all proprietors" equal rights, including the right to "hire other persons for work."

As already reported, the last session of the present convocation on the eve of the coming 24th February elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet started last week. It adopted laws "On the Press and Other Mass Information Media" and "On the Fundamentals of Local Self-Government," the resolution "On the Soviet-German Treaties of 1939 and Liquidation of Their Consequences for Lithuania." Deputies examined a number of other important questions of state and public life of the republic, on which they still have to adopt decisions.

The session will continue its work tomorrow.

Lithuanian Resolution Annuls Accession to USSR

PM1202155190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 10 Feb 90 p 1

["Our correspondent" V. Zarovskiy report: "Latest Fact on the Pact"]

[Text] Vilnius—The work of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation is nearing its end. There will soon be elections to the republic's parliament. New deputies will arrive and will have to decide what path Lithuania should travel. But in the meantime so many questions have accumulated in the "old" Supreme Soviet that it is planned to finish the 17th session only in a week's time. Many arguments arose over the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's decision to refer for discussion by deputies the question of direct, nationwide elections of the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet.

A complex question was examined yesterday—the resolution "On the 1939 Soviet-German Treaties and the Elimination of Their Consequences for Lithuania." It has to be said that the proposed draft was based largely on the conclusions of two commissions—a republican commission and an all-union commission—on the Ribbentrop and Molotov pact. I will cite the adopted resolution in full:

1. To declare that the Lithuanian People's Seimas declaration of 21 July 1940 on Lithuania's entry into the USSR is illegal and invalid since it did not express the Lithuanian people's will.

2. To state that the USSR law of 3 August 1940 "On the Admission of the Lithuanian SSR to the USSR" based on the Lithuanian People's Seimas declaration of 21 July 1940 is illegal and not legally binding on Lithuania.

3. To instruct the USSR to begin bilateral talks on restoring the independence of the Lithuanian state."

The resolution is aimed at eliminating the secret prewar treaties and restoring the violated rights of the Lithuanian state and Lithuanian people "which Soviet Russia recognized in perpetuity in the peace treaty of 12 July 1920 between Soviet Russia and Lithuania."

Moscow TV on Split in Lithuanian Communist Party

LD1102205790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 11 Feb 90

[from the "Seven Days" newscast presented by Aleksandr Krutov]

[Text] Some people are explaining the creation of an independent Communist Party of Lithuania by the fact that the general rates of perestroyka in the party did not satisfy the Lithuanian party organization. Others consider that all the perestroyka processes in the republic come down to the republic—Lithuania—withdrawing, leaving the composition of the Soviet Union. It was precisely this reason which led to the formation of two Communist Parties in Lithuania.

As you know, the plenum unanimously condemned the actions which led to the undermining of the CPSU'S unity, and voiced complete support for communists who remained faithful to the party. But the door remains open, as they say. Think, decide! The moment is a very, very crucial one. Not only debates at the rostum are necessary today, but also profound reflection and interpretation of what has happened and what will happen in the party, in the country, and in ourselves. After all, another problem is quite clearly being added to the numerous problems of perestroyka: Perhaps the most dangerous problem—a schism in the party, a schism in the state.

You know, today one often hears that the plenum should have put the question more harshly, and perhaps it even should even have declared the independent Communist Party of Lithuania illegal. But just think: That would have fundamentally contradicted the very spirit of the plenum decision. The dialogue can and must be continued.

Astraukas' Resignation Speech Reported

90UN0839B Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 17 Jan 90 p 2

[Speech by V. Astraukas, former chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in Vilnius; date not given]

[Text] Dear Comrade Deputies! I had repeatedly raised the issue of my continuation in the office of chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. First of all following the elections of USSR people's deputies, when I was not elected. This was discussed in the Lithuanian Communist Party [LiCP] Central Committee Bureau. I was advised to continue in this office. I took the advice. I requested that I be relieved of my duties at the previous session also. But Algirdas Brazauskas, Vladimir Berezov, and other members of the Central Committee Bureau counseled against this question being raised at the session. I have tried to work conscientiously and have endeavored together with others to ensure that the activity of the Supreme Soviet and the Presidium correspond as well as possible to the spirit of perestroyka and the hopes and cherished aspirations of the Lithuanian people and all inhabitants of Lithuania. I believe that history will evaluate objectively the work of the 11th Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet in recent years and the important decisions which it has adopted. It was my great honor to append my signature to state documents of historic significance which were adopted by the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium. I worked as best I could. Although the conditions were for me sometimes not entirely favorable, I did not bear a grudge. I drew spiritual fortitude from contacts with people and their letters expressing trust and a readiness to assist the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium. I have to say that I no less than any patriot love Lithuania, support its revival, and believe in Lithuania's fine future. I take keenly to heart the fact that I managed to get done far from everything and that there have been blunders, too. My state of health has deteriorated recently, and for this reason I urgently ask that the Supreme Soviet release me from the duties of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Inasmuch as, in accordance with the USSR Constitution currently in force, I am a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, I have notified Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, of my intention to address this request to the republic Supreme Soviet. This request was, as you know, read out in public. I wholeheartedly thank the Supreme Soviet, its Presidium and the inhabitants of Lithuania for their trust and assistance in the common cause.

The Supreme Soviet Presidium will operate until the formation of the new Presidium. This is to happen in mid-March. There is much work to be done. An important session of the Supreme Soviet, for which we need to prepare as well as possible, lies ahead. The Supreme Soviet Presidium still has to examine many important issues for Lithuania. I cannot work in a slipshod fashion, but my health simply does not allow me to give to the work all my effort and experience. A crucial political campaign is under way currently. The inhabitants of Lithuania will form a new parliament of the Lithuanian Republic by the truly democratic path. At this very crucial time the Presidium should be headed by a person who will run for the new Supreme Soviet. If the first part of this question is resolved, I will make so bold as to submit for the deputies' examination the question of the election of Algirdas Brazauskas chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. This man is known in Lithuania, the country, and outside. There is no need, I believe, for introductions. I wish merely to mention that he is characterized by the traits of a political leader and statesman and is endowed with all the human attributes necessary for heading the Presidium. He is a USSR people's deputy and member of the USSR Supreme

Soviet. These are very important and necessary points for the very crucial stage for Lithuania. I ask that you study my request and satisfy it and also decide the question of the election of a new chairman. Thank you.

Brazauskas' Gives Election Acceptance Speech

90UN0839A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 17 Jan 90 p 1

[Speech by A. Brazauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet in Vilnius; date not given]

[Text] Dear Deputies! Your decision is a significant event in my life. I would like to share certain thoughts and also answer questions put by the deputies in the course of the discussion. I would like you to understand that I made no attempts to become chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium.

There is a very great deal of work in the party office which has been entrusted to me. I will, therefore, begin with affairs in the Lithuanian Communist Party [LiCP]. Deputies Z. Shlichite and K. Uoka spoke about the future of the LiCP. I am grateful that even nonparty persons are displaying concern for its fate and future. Not only the inhabitants of Lithuania but many who live outside of Lithuania also are taking its cause to heart.

A fundamental restructuring of the entire political system is needed. In our republic it was begun by the LiCP. Are our 20th congress and the decisions adopted there not a new step toward a normal political system? This is a step which has been supported by the vast majority of Lithuania's communists. You know that some communists are taking a different path. This is their business. The organizational work is being performed and the party structures are being shaped now. I believe that in the very near future we will know how many members we have. From a state type of party the LiCP has become a normal political party, which must aspire to fulfillment of its program and its enrichment with new content. Its purpose is to seek to ensure that the Lithuanian people and the other peoples living in Lithuania understand and support our ideas. The Communist Party is no longer performing the functions that it was performing even recently, just 18 months ago.

The authority of the LiCP now is identical to the authority of the parties of the other republics and the oblast party organizations. I do not know by what standards our influence on the processes and phenomena which will occur in the CPSU and its Central Committee and on its plenums can be gauged. This can only be guessed at, although we have certain experience in forecasting events.

We must appreciate the fact that we are living in a highly complex transition period and that the new party, political, and economic structures are not yet settled. There is work to be done! We have to enact many new laws, which have already or are being prepared. What the deputies of the 11th convocation are unable to get done, the new parliament will have to do. What we need primarily are laws that really consolidate our economic independence. Without them our train will hardly move. This work has only just begun.

The 20th LiCP Congress elected a new Central Committee, and its plenum, a very active 19-man Bureau. Evaluating the possibilities of the LiCP Central Committee and its Bureau and Secretariat, I hope to give much time and, possibly, the main attention to the Supreme Soviet. Thus I hope to justify the trust that you have shown in me today in electing me chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. How our life will take shape will depend on all of us here in this hall, on those who in the evening will follow the work of the session on television and all inhabitants of Lithuania.

The visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and that of a large group of senior party and soviet officials ended the day before yesterday. We would like to think that Comrade M.S. Gorbachev and the others took away with them the most pleasant impressions of Lithuania and its people. But I cannot speak about their impressions today. The opinions are ambivalent, it would seem to me. The problem and the collision, which are being encountered in the country's party life for the first time, are not yet settled. A CPSU Central Committee plenum will be held on 29 January, and decisions in respect to us will evidently be adopted there. But the LiCP Program and Rules are in effect, and the party organizations are being formed from scratch. This process cannot and should not be halted.

I will also have a great deal of work as chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. My main duty in this office today is as follows: Having united the forces of the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, the government and, as far as our influence permits, the party authorities and other organizations, to exercise Lithuania's economic independence. I emphasize once again: This is the most important mission. Other tasks in legislation and social and political life await us at the same time also.

I began my working life as an ordinary engineer, and my whole life has been associated with the working people. I am by trade a construction worker and sat the examinations of life's universities together with workers, construction workers primarily. I have headed an organization and held higher office also. I have always believed that my interests as a man, leader, and communist are inseparable from those by which the collective and the people with whom I worked live. For me this has always been a natural thing.

The impression is that we have forgotten about the workers and the peasantry. These rebukes are being expressed, and not only by Deputy K. Uoka. Pulled into the maelstrom of political events, we have forgotten many things. But are obliged to remember many things also. We must start to live normally, and the parliament and government must work normally. Work in planned manner, without spurious fuss. Proceed along the chosen path confidently and firmly, not allowing ourselves to be harassed on all sides. Such must be our line. The working class and all people whose hands create material benefits must always be at the center of our attention. In adopting documents and thinking about economic independence we must not forget about people. In aspiring to independence and the restoration of statehood we are obliged to do everything to ensure that not one person, not one family suffer in this crucial transition period.

I once again sincerely thank you for the trust that you have placed in me. I will work to the best of my abilities and as my conscience dictates.

I also wish to thank Vitautas Astrauskas, with whom I have worked side by side for many years sometimes in one, sometimes in another outfit. As a member of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, I tried to take an active part in the meetings. I always noticed and wish now to mention such qualities of Vitautas Astrauskas as tolerance and benevolence toward all people. I wish him this in the future also and would like him to continue to take an active part in our public life. The era, our times are exceptionally interesting, and we will one day tell our children and grandchildren how interesting our lives were in 1989-1990 and, possibly, in subsequent years. Thank you, dear friends!

Debate on Servicemen's Vote in Lithuania

90UN0839D Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 17 Jan 90 p 2

[First of two installments of unattributed report: "Debate on the Referendum Issue"]

[Text] The debate on the report on the calling of the referendum "Right To Vote of Servicemen Who Are Not Permanent Residents of the Republic at the Elections of Deputies of the Supreme Soviet and Local Soviets of People's Deputies of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]" was begun by Deputy Yustinas Antanaytis, general director of the republic "Litimpeks" Financially Autonomous Foreign Trade Association, at the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers. He proposed that a referendum not be called. It is important to remove the reasons in respect of which this question appeared on the session agenda: To change the election laws in such a way that only people who reside permanently in Lithuania have the right to vote. In the speaker's opinion, it is not difficult predicting the results of a referendum even now. Yet this measure would cost more than R1 million. In addition, three whole election campaigns would have been conducted within six weeks. Is this not too many?

Yu. Antanaytis proposed an amendment to the Referendum Act. A referendum is not called, despite the fact that there is a sufficient number of signatures of citizens approving it, if the issue in respect of which uncertainties have arisen is resolved.

"I have spoken on this question at the two previous sessions," Deputy Anatoliyus Rasteyka, an architect, said. "I proposed then that no exception be made for servicemen to the general procedure adopted by an edict at the 13th session that only citizens of Lithuania who are permanent residents thereof, and not those who have been sent here on assignment or are here temporarily for service in military units stationed in Lithuania, may participate in elections. Unfortunately, Clause 2 of the decree which was issued at the 13th session made such an exception. It is for this reason that people have demanded a referendum. However, its outcome is already clear. Following a referendum, military personnel serving temporarily in Lithuania would not be able to take part in elections. So is it worth wasting time and spending state money. Would it not be better now to rescind Clause 2 of the decree of the 13th session "Procedure of Validation of the Lithuanian SSR Law 'Elections of Deputies of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet'" and also the analogous clause on the elections of local soviets? I propose a vote on this question."

Deputy Valeriyonas Kubilyus, first secretary of the Kretingskiy Rayon Party Committee, mounted the podium.

People are tired of politicking. They are demanding that efforts be concentrated on economic matters and actual practical issues. We need to think well about the results of a referendum. Inhabitants of the rayon whom I have met are advocating that servicemen who are not permanent residents of the republic should not take part in the elections. They argue this position by the fact that servicemen do not participate in the life of the republic. They have, after all, limited opportunities for going beyond the confines of the military unit, and many of them live on republic territory for two years or less even. Permanent residents are not deprived of this right. This should not be a source of grievance for the military, therefore. I support the proposal that the Supreme Soviet today decide the question of the participation in the elections of the Supreme Soviet and local soviets of people's deputies of the republic of servicemen who are not permanent residents of Lithuania. If we decide that they will not participate in the elections, there will be no need for a referendum.

This proposal was supported by USSR People's Deputy Vitautas Landsbergis, professor of the Lithuanian Conservatoire, also.

"It is obvious," he observed, "that the question needs to be decided practically. I would suggest that the problem itself be formulated more correctly. The word 'servicemen' is employed too often. It should in fact be as follows: No nonpermanent resident of the republic should be accorded any exceptions or privileges. An exception has been made for or a certain privilege accorded some nonpermanent residents of the republic—men on active service—in this case."

(To be concluded in the next issue)

Servicemen's Vote Referendum Report

90UN0839C Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 17 Jan 90 p 2

[Report by P. Kuris, deputy of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and Lithuanian SSR minister of justice, to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet in Vilnius; date not given]

[Text] At the behest of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium I notify you of the situation that has taken shape in connection with the calling of a referendum.

In accordance with the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, the solution of most important questions of the republic's state and public life and the enactment of Lithuanian SSR laws are possible by way of a referendum.

The Lithuanian SSR Referendum Act accorded republic Supreme Soviet deputies and the people the right to initiate the calling of a referendum. The act determines that public initiative regarding the calling of a referendum is expressed by a proposal of 300,000 citizens of the republic eligible to vote. On 15 November 1989 a group of 10 people eligible to vote registered in the Vilnius Notary's Office as the sponsor of the calling of a referendum. On 16 November the group began the collection of signatures of citizens of the republic to the following piece of text:

"I demand notice of a referendum, in the course of which citizens of the Lithuanian SSR will express their opinion as to whether servicemen who are not permanent residents of the Lithuanian SSR have the right to participate in the ballot for the election of deputies to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet or not. The referendum should be held prior to the elections to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet." The collection of signatures was conducted from 16 November through 10 December 1989, without infringement on the month's time frame determined by the Referendum Act. On 11 December, the sponsoring group of citizens handed the Supreme Soviet Presidium a proposal-petition from 422,411 citizens and a final act on the announcement of a referendum. Having received these documents, the Supreme Soviet Presidium verified the documents submitted by the sponsoring group in accordance with Article 11 of the act. The Presidium determined that 296,783 of the proposal-petitions had been filled in incorrectly, and it was decided on 18 December to suggest that the sponsors remove these shortcomings within 15 days. On 27 December the sponsoring group returned the former documents, but additionally submitted 31,357 citizens' proposal-petitions. The commission formed for determining the validity of the signatures to the referendum announcement reported that the documents submitted by the sponsoring group were in keeping with the requirements of Article 9 of the Lithuanian SSR Referendum Act.

On 8 January of this year the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium acknowledged that the documents submitted by the sponsoring group for the calling of a referendum were in keeping with the requirements of the act and that the final act could be handed to the Supreme Soviet.

The Referendum Act determines what actions can and should be performed by the Supreme Soviet upon the receipt of material from the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Article 12 of the act proclaims that upon receipt of a properly registered proposal the Supreme Soviet must issue a decree on the calling of a referendum, and Article 13 indicates the content of the decree on the announcement of a referendum. In other words, unless the Presidium establishes infringements of the law, the jurisdiction of the Supreme Soviet on the question of the calling of a referendum is basically of a procedural nature, that is, determination of the date of the referendum. The Supreme Soviet is not accorded the right to waive notice of a referendum on any grounds other than those associated with infringements of the Referendum Act. In this case the public initiative is of higher legal force than the deputies' opinion. With regard to the authority accorded the Supreme Soviet by the act, the Presidium has prepared the draft Supreme Soviet decree "Notice of a Referendum". Wording of the decree of the following content is suggested:

1. In accordance with Article 5 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution (Basic Law), to decide by way of referendum the question of the granting of servicemen who are not permanent residents of the republic the right to participate in the balloting for the election of deputies of the Supreme Soviet and deputies of the local soviets of people's deputies of the Lithuanian SSR.

2. To hold a referendum on this issue on 11 February of the current year.

3. To instruct the republic Electoral Commission for the election of deputies of the 12th Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet to also exercise the functions of republic referendum commission, and the rayon and city (cities of republic jurisdiction) electoral commissions for the election of deputies of the corresponding soviets of people's deputies, the functions of rayon and city referendum commissions.

4. To determine that the electoral precincts formed for the election of deputies of the 12th Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet be identical to the precincts for the ballot for the referendum. To instruct the precinct electoral commissions to exercise the functions of precinct referendum commissions. I have to tell you that a different opinion has been made known at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium also. The deputies of the Supreme Soviet may themselves revise their decrees of 29 September 1989 and 7 December 1989 regulating the procedure of the entry into force of the laws on the elections of people's deputies of the Supreme Soviet and deputies of the local soviets of people's deputies. These decrees determine that prior to the realization of the

Lithuanian SSR Citizenship Act, full suffrage is granted not only to permanent residents with the right to republic citizenship, but also nonpermanent residents in the person of servicemen of military units stationed on the territory of the Lithuanian SSR. In the opinion of the supporters of this position, the path of referendum is too costly a method of settling the conflict between the deputies and the electorate since it would cost the republic more than R1 million.

The sponsors of the referendum who took part in the meeting of the Presidium told the Supreme Soviet Presidium that they aspire not to the holding of a referendum, but to a change in the Election Act. Given the appropriate changes by the Supreme Soviet, they would forgo the demand for a referendum. Consequently, if the deputies themselves decide to alter the decisions which they made earlier, it would be sufficient to vote for the revocation of Clauses 2 of both decrees (of 29 September 1989 and 7 December 1989) according nonpermanent residents of Lithuania who are not citizens of the Lithuanian SSR the right to participate in elections. But the Referendum Act did not accord the Supreme Soviet the right not to call a referendum even in the event of the sponsoring group waiving this demand. The expression of the wishes of 300,000 voters is deemed more important in this case. Such an obvious miscalculation in the act could be eliminated at this session, the Referendum Act having been supplemented by the following provision: "The sponsors of a referendum have the right to waive the proposal they have submitted for the announcement of a referendum before the Supreme Soviet has issued a decree on the announcement of a referendum." Such wording could be inserted in Article 12 of the Referendum Act.

Another version of the addition to Article 12 of the Referendum Act is possible also. Thus given the establishment of the right of the Supreme Soviet not to call a referendum on an issue in respect of which an initiative of the electorate concerning a referendum has been expressed if this issue has already been resolved by another method or other path. In this case the adoption of an amendment to the Referendum Act and a change in the Supreme Soviet decrees on election laws would preclude the need for a referendum.

Belorussian Workers' Union Formed

90UN0813A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 28 January 90 p 2

[Interview with G. Mukhin, member of the organizational committee of the Workers Union of Belorussia, by I. Baranovskiy under the rubric "Leaders of the Informals: Who Is Who?": "I Am Not a 'Labor Force'"]

[Text] **Just yesterday no one knew of them—and in fact, they did not exist. But the rain has come after a long drought, and like mushrooms the informal groups and movements have begun to appear here and there. It is not so easy to figure out who represents what. There must be a dialog. It is necessary to hear each other out. Our correspondent met with G. Mukhin, a machine adjuster with the design machine directorate of the Minsk "Electronmash" factory and member of the organizational committee of the recently created Workers Union of Belorussia.**

[Baranovskiy] Georgiy Semenovich, the word "worker" has not enjoyed a special popularity recently. Most of all, many put it alongside such notions as conservatism, an amorphous mass, and ignorant belligerence, and the proletariat is regarded as nothing more than an obedient plaything in the hands of the party apparatus. Nonetheless, you were not afraid to call yourselves a union of workers.

[Mukhin] In fact, many injustices in our country have been committed in the name of the working man, "at the request of the workers," whether it was increased prices, the campaign of abuse against Solzhenitsyn, or the curtailment of citizens' constitutional rights. Take a look around—who voted for these decisions?—and you will not find any of them beside you. In the meantime, quietly, imperceptibly, the genuine workers have been pushed away from the levers of real power. Functionaries and clerks armed with demagogic slogans have moved into their places. In this bureaucratic system the workers have been handed an unenviable role—to approve and support unanimously the instructions that are handed down "from above." We have created our union in order to rouse people somehow, to revive the best traditions of the working class, to stop the spiritual degradation of the working man.

[Baranovskiy] Degradation? Up to this time the working class has proclaimed itself the moving force behind our society....

[Mukhin] Those are only pretty words. For a long time we have not been the moving force, just a "labor force." Take our "Elektronmash" factory. Production is complex, requiring a lot of special training. Therefore, I am not afraid to say, here are collected the "cream" of the working class—intellectual people. But even at such an enterprise the level of political activity is extremely low. All questions are decided "according to the stomach:" If there is a kopek in the pocket and sausage at home, we are content and do not give a damn. If not, we begin to curse and maybe they will make us a gift of something. So the working class is not in the avant garde—you will not even find it bringing up the rear of the political life of the country....

[Baranovskiy] Many may not agree with you here. But how do you stand with the United Front of Toilers [OFT], which announced itself at the top of its voice recently, or with the Council of Labor Collectives [STK] created at the enterprises?

[Mukhin] My attitude toward the OFT is mixed: There are already too many "white crows"—office workers—in its ranks. As for the STK's.... At any enterprise, there is an administration and a trade union. So why do they need this additional superstructure? They are only playing at democracy. Today incompetent people continually get involved in processes they do not understand very well. I myself was a member of an STK and I know how it happens. Let us say that the head of a production dispatch department walks up and gives us some planned figures. But what is the sense of getting figures verbally? They need to be analyzed for hours with a pencil in hand. But we sit and sit with an intelligent look on our faces—and then we vote on them. It is a total perversion! Incidentally, I left the STK voluntarily—the Workers Union gave it a vote of no confidence.

[Baranovskiy] Listening to you, it seems that your condemnation of both today's trade unions and the STK's is complete. But as they say, destroying is not the same as building. We have become skilled at turning out snappy slogans. But where do we go from there?

[Baranovskiy] That is the problem. Today we destroy some injustice, something that has ceased to function—and we are right to do so. But we do not know what to do next, what to build in its place. We do not wish to tear everything to the ground. We have had enough—it has already been a sorrowful experience. As a result the union is actively seeking contacts with lawyers, economists, and philosophers.

The union is only getting on its feet. But at our factory about 200 people have already signed up. We could pull in more people, but we are not looking for quantity.

There are similar organizations at Belorussia's other enterprises. For instance at the machine-tool factory imeni Kirova, at the bicycle factory, and at the "Gorizont" television factory. Recently groups of the Workers Union have appeared in Grodno and Mogilev.

In the few months that the Workers Union has existed some things have been accomplished. For example, at my factory they abolished socialist competition. Everyone knew that it was fake, but they "competed," published endless "flashes," set up stands and honor rolls, presented challenge banners, pennants, and prizes.... It reached the point of lunacy: By turn they wrote each other out bonuses as production shock workers. Who needs this fraud? And how much money did this siphon from the factory's budget? They calculated it up—R120,000. Now we have increased the worker's annual vacation with these funds: Now they can vacation 24 days, not counting Sundays. And we have not forgotten our women—we have increased paid maternity leave up to three years. Each such mother will receive R700 per month.

[Baranovskiy] Yes, you have a number of trump cards in your deck. Now, as elections to the Supreme Soviet and the republic's local soviets approach, do you hope for success?

[Mukhin] Of course. But we are not trying to nominate as many deputies as possible from the Workers Union. Our people are active even without that. They have already become involved in work. Those others wait for a command—they say, boys, say who it is and we will support him. We do not wish to go that way—let people think for themselves. I am sure that at each large farm and at each enterprise there is a person worthy of being elected to the Supreme Soviet. We only need to find him.

[Baranovskiy] But while you are searching the farms and factories for suitable candidates, the functionaries will end up occupying all the seats in the soviets. The election contest promises to be a difficult one, and your political opponents are certainly not sitting around idle.

[Mukhin] I would rather not call them opponents. Competitors would be better. And the word "contest," in my opinion, also does not seem the most appropriate. "Effort" is more suitable.

[Baranovskiy] What is your attitude toward the intelligentsia? Toward contacts with them?

[Mukhin] We have a common destiny, a common fate. We are a single people and we should have the same plans.

[Baranovskiy] Strikes have recently been spreading through the country. Do you consider them an acceptable tool for political or economic struggle?

[Mukhin] I believe that they are a normal phenomenon. Nonetheless, I think people should refrain from striking for one or two years. It is already a very difficult, crucial period we are living through.

[Baranovskiy] A last question. This is not the best of times for our country: National passions are boiling, and voices in the republic cry out more and more often for secession from the USSR. What sort of future do you see for Belorussia?

[Mukhin] I am in favor of sovereignty for the republic—economic and political. But I do not see it and do not wish to see it as a separate state. Our ties with Russia go back to the distant past and we arose from a common origin.

Belorussian Resolution on Chernobyl Victims

90UN0858A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 6 Jan 90 p 1

[Resolution issued by the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and Belorussian Trade Union Council in Minsk: "On Additional Measures and Procedure for Providing Housing for Citizens Traveling to a New Place of Residence From Populated Points Subject to Radioactive Contamination as a Result of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES"; date not given]

[Text] In compliance with Resolution 886 of the USSR Council of Ministers Ministry of All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] "On Additional Measures To Provide Better Safeguards for the Health and Improve the Well-Being of the Population Living on Territory Subject to Radioactive Contamination as the

Result of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES [Nuclear Power Station]" dated 20 October 1989, and as a supplement to Resolution 319 of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers dated 7 December 1989, the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers and Belorussian republic trade union councils resolve the following:

1. To establish that new settlements will be built for the resettlement of citizens living in the populated points noted in List 1 of the State Program for the Cleanup in the Belorussian SSR Following the Accident at the Chernobyl AES during the period 1990-1995, and also for families living in localities as defined by Clauses 7 and 9 of Resolution 886 of the USSR Council of Ministers dated 20 October 1989 that have family members for whom for medical reasons it has been recommended that they be provided with housing under the procedure as provided for by Resolution 319 of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers dated 7 December 1989.

2. To provide for citizens living in populated areas whose inhabitants are being resettled in accordance with the State Program for the Cleanup in the Belorussian SSR Following the Accident at the Chernobyl AES for the Period 1990-1995 and Resolution 886 of the USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU dated 20 October 1989, as follows:

—To acquire for them private housing, and also empty apartments in apartments houses that are part of the state and public housing inventory awaiting reconstruction and capital repair, regardless of registration in the populated point chosen for resettlement;

—To acquire plots of land for individual housing construction (except in the City of Minsk and the oblast centers), acquire the necessary construction materials, and conclude contracts with contract organizations for the construction of housing with outbuildings.

—To recommend that enterprises, establishments, organizations, kolkhozes [collective farms], and public organizations provide assistance with the agreement of the labor collectives to such of these citizens who start working with them in the repayment of loans provided for individual housing construction, and also to sell them farmstead-type houses (regardless of their work seniority) on favorable terms as provided for in Resolution 197 of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers dated 11 February 1988.

3. To establish that private houses that legally belong to citizens resettling in a new place of residence will, after payment of compensation, be allocated to the inventory of the local soviet of people's deputies or the inventory of the housing organization in accordance with instructions from the appropriate soviet of people's deputies executive committee.

Housing in apartment houses of the state and public housing inventory and the houses of housing-construction cooperatives will be offered in accordance with established procedure when citizens leave.

4. Certificates issued by the executive committee of the oblast soviet of people's deputies will constitute the document confirming the right of a citizen to move to a new place of residence from a location that has been subjected to radioactive contamination, as established by Resolution 319 of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee and Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers dated 7 December 1989.
[signed]M. Kovalev, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers.
V. Goncharuk, chairman of the republic trade union council.

Ukrainian Party Issues Resolution on '30s' Famine

LD0702123390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1038 GMT 7 Feb 90

["Ukraine CP Resolution on 1930s Famine: Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine"—TASS headline]

[Text] Kiev, 7 February, (RATAU-TASS)—The Ukrainian newspapers today publish the resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the republic "On the Famine of the Years 1932-1933 in the Ukraine and the Publication of Archive Materials Connected Therewith".

For more than half a century, Soviet historiography kept silent on the subject of the people's tragedy of those years, which led to the death from starvation of millions of people. The resolution says that scientists of the Ukraine have concluded, on the basis of archive materials on the famine of the years 1932-1933, that at the root of the food supply difficulties followed by famine in the Ukraine, as also in certain other regions of the USSR, "lay deviation by the then leadership of the country and republic from Lenin's principles of peasant cooperatives. Forcible methods of collectivization, mass 'dekulakization', low standards of agriculture, poor technical provision of collective farms, and other causes led to a fall in the gross harvest of grain".

The decline of agricultural production in the course of 1932 was the cause of a substantial reduction in the volume of state procurements, the document continues. But the Stalinist leadership stepped up its pressure on the Republican party and state bodies for the purpose of increasing deliveries of bread grain.

Documentary evidence is used to show how the leadership of the republic was unable to stand up to dictate and effectively pursued a policy which resulted for the Ukrainian people in numerous victims. Resolutions were adopted in which the main stake in bread grain procurements was placed on administrative-repressive methods.

Thousands of chairmen and members of the administrations of collective farms, specialists, party and local soviet officials were arrested and condemned for "connivance at KULAK sabotage".

Archive materials draw a tragic picture of the mass death rate from famine and epidemics, especially starting from March 1933. The same fate overcame the peasantry of the North Caucasus, volga region, and a number of other regions. Documents also reflect the attempts by party and state bodies to give food aid to the famine-stricken regions. But it came too late and was insufficient to avert the disaster.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, the resolution says, resolutely dissociates itself from the forcible, repressive methods of solving problems of social development.

Ukraine Khmelnitskiy Obkom Leader Resigns

LD1202202690 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 11 Feb 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Under pressure from inhabitants of Khmelnitskiy Oblast, Vladimir Dikusarov, first secretary of the party oblast committee [obkom], submitted a request to be released from his post in connection with this retirement. The obkom's plenum, held on 9 February, agreed to his request. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Obkoms Replace First Secretaries

PM1202161390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Feb 90 First Edition p 2

[TASS reports under general headline: "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Ivano-Frankovsk, 10 Feb—A plenum of Ivano-Frankovsk Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom [oblast committee] was held to examine an organizational question. The plenum relieved I.G. Postoronko of his duties as party obkom first secretary in connection with his retirement on pension.

As a result of a secret ballot, with several candidates standing, the plenum elected Z.V. Kuravskoy, hitherto chief of the obkom Ideological Department, to be first secretary of Ivano-Frankovsk Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom.

Khmelnitskiy, 10 Feb—A plenum of Khmelnitskiy Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom was held to examine an organizational question.

The plenum relieved V.G. Dikusarov of his duties as party obkom first secretary in connection with his retirement on pension.

The plenum adopted the following decision: The performance of the duties of first secretary should be assigned to V.I. Kupratyy, second secretary of the party obkom, until the report and election conference.

Ukrainian Party Obkom First Secretary Resigns

LD0802182190 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1945 GMT 7 Feb 90

[Excerpt] Ivan Grigoryevich Postoronko, first secretary of the Ivano-Frankovsk Oblast Party Committee, has submitted a request to release him from this post in connection with his retirement on pension. The request will be examined at the 9 February plenum of the party obkom.

Meanwhile, party organizations of the oblast are nominating and discussing candidates for the post of first secretary of the party obkom. So far, 20 candidates have been nominated. [passage omitted]

Ukrainian Oblast Secretaries Changed

LD1002224490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Feb 90

[Text] Today there were several oblast party committee plenums. A plenum of the Donetsk Oblast Party Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party examined the issue of the socio-political situation which has formed in the oblast. In connection with the submitted application, the plenum released Comrade Vinnik from the post of first secretary of the oblast party committee. Comrade Mironov, second secretary of the oblast party committee, has been charged with acting as first secretary of the Donetsk Oblast Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party until the report-back and election conference. The plenum broke off its work with a view to discussing in primary party organizations the situation which has emerged in the oblast and with a view to preparing proposals for holding the party conference.

In Uzhgorod, a plenum of the Transcarpathian Oblast Party Committee reviewed an organizational issue. Comrade Bandrovskiy, in connection with his retirment on pension, has been released from the office of first secretary of the oblast party committee. The participants in the plenum elected, in a secret ballot of several candidates, Comrade (Voloshcuk), who has worked as prorector of the Uzhgorod State University, as first secretary of the Transcarpathian Oblast Party Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

Chernobyl Comission Meets in Kiev

LD0902044990 Moscow TASS in English 2321 GMT 8 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 9 TASS—At its visiting session in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] in January, the Government Chernobyl Commission has considered applications and proposals from the people, who were directly involved in the elimination of the Chernobyl accident consequences, concerning their medical attendance and social welfare.

Commission Chairman, Deputy Prime Minister of the USSR V.Kh. Doguzhiyev and some commission members visited the All-Union Scientific Centre of Radiation Medicine of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences in Kiev to get acquainted with the work, being carried out by scientists and specialists, to protect the health of the people who suffered from the Chernobyl accident. They met with doctors and people, who participated in the elimination of consequences of the Chernobyl accident, and who are now undergoing medical treatment at the centre's clinic.

These questions were then considered in Chernobyl with the participation of representatives of the administration and public organisations of the Chernobyl station and the Scientific Production Association Pripyat, the public organisation Chernobyl, senior officials of ministries and department concerned.

The government commission instructed the USSR Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry, to draft jointly with the Ministry of Public Health of the USSR, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, the Ministry of Defence (Civil Defence of the USSR) and representatives of public organisations, a USSR Government's decision on medical attendance and social welfare of the people, who were directly involved in the elimination of the Chernobyl accident consequences, and became ill or invalids, and to submit it to the USSR Council of Ministers in the first quarter of this year.

The decision is being drafted under the government commission's control.

Kiev Meeting Protests Provocations

LD1202133490 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 11 Feb 90

[Text] [Announcer] A meeting attended by several thousand people under the slogan "We Want Changes" took place in Kiev today. It was organized by the Kiev branch and the Secretariat of Rukh, the Ukrainian deputies' club, and the T. Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society. The meeting was addressed by USSR people's deputies, candidates for deputies to republican and local soviets, secretaries of the party gorkom and raykoms of Kiev, representatives of many public organizations, and guests of the city.

The meeting was opened by writer Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, one of the leaders of Rukh:

[Begin recording] [Yavorivskyy] Dear Kievites, including the right-wingers who are not always in the right, the left-wingers, the centerists and egocenterists, and all others!

Our history, the history of the Ukrainian people, has reached possibly its highest point in the spiral. Never before has such a burdensome, such penal, responsibility rested on our shoulders as today. The situation in the country is complicated. Today we have the opportunity to display all our wisdom, all our experience, and all political tact in order to bring about all those changes which are so awaited by our tired and exhausted people, in a parliamentary way, in a wise and reasonable way, being aware of all the complexity.

We should be aware of all those daily and continuous provocations of the reactionary forces who feel that the ground is slipping away from their feet. An uneasy situation is prevailing in the Ukraine because there are some who are spreading perfidious and vile rumors that tomorrow a confrontation will break out between us, between the people who regard the Ukraine as their homeland, although being of various nationalities. There are some who even give the date of pogroms.

We must state today that we have been through more difficult times. We have been through the famine-holocaust of 1933, we have been through the bloody Stalinist repressions, we have been through the great and difficult war in which we paid with an immeasurable amount of our people's blood, we have been through the stagnation, during which we lost so much of the intellectual potential of our people— and if we have survived all of this, then today we will not give in to these provocations. Indeed, we are standing at the abyss, and therefore we must support each other by holding hands and no one will succeed today in breaking this live chain.

[Meeting chairman] An ordinary female collective farmer has managed to get here, on the platform. Her name is Maria Khryshchuk, from Khmelnitskiy Oblast. She arrived in Kiev to look for the truth. She asks only for three minutes. Shall we grant her request? [shouts from audience: Yes! yes!]

[Khryshchuk] Esteemed comrades of the same mind, all honest people of Ukraine! You are being addressed by a woman from Khmelnitskiy Oblast. I arrived in Kiev to take part in the meeting; I could not stay home. Great changes are taking place in our republic which have not by-passed our Khmelnitskiy Oblast. Under pressure from inhabitants of the oblast, Vladimir Dikusarov, first secretary of the party obkom, submitted a request to the obkom's plenum that he would like to leave the post of his free will in connection with retirement on pension. The plenum took place on 9 February and satisfied his request. I am calling you to stay united, for our strength lies in unity. [end recording]

[Announcer] At the end of the meeting the floor was given to Mykhaylo Horovenko, secretary of the Kiev party gorkom:

[Begin Horovenko recording] I would like to put one request to all Kievites, whether they are party members or nonaffiliated, believers or atheists: We are truly marching toward the democratic elections. Let us not throw stones at each other. [derisory shouts and whistling from the audience] Let us march toward the good, to democracy, to justice, to the understanding of one another. [shouts from audience becoming louder] Let us learn to listen to people. [shouts of disapproval even louder] I am as much a Ukrainian as you are. [shouts and whistling from auidence] I also wish happiness and flourishing to our people. Only a path of reconciliation, a path of good and wise compromises can lead to peace in our region. [end recording]

Ivashko Attends Ukrainian Party Commission Session

PM0202144690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Feb 90 First Edition p 3

[PRAVDA correspondent M. Odinets report: "Preparing for the Congress"]

[Text] Kiev, 1 Feb—A session of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee commission to summarize proposals for the CPSU Statutes and draft a Ukrainian Communist Party action program in connection with preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress was held in Kiev today. It was opened by V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee. Members of the commission and workers on party and soviet organs took part in the session.

Economic

Views Regarding Increase in Transport Tariffs

Labor Official Protests

904A0178A Moscow TRUD in Russian
7 Feb 90 p 2

[Article by V. Kuzmishchev: "To Avoid Conflict Before It Is Too Late"]

[Text] Let us recall the essence of the problem. The decision by the government to increase wholesale prices for diesel fuel, tariffs for freight transportation, and for electricity for industrial and a number of other enterprises effective 1 January 1990 brought about deterioration of the economic position of enterprises.

All of this abruptly exacerbated the situation in the field. A number of collectives demanded that strike committees be set up. The consequences could have become unpredictable. The situation was discussed by an interunion trade union commission set up by the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] which approached the USSR Council of Ministers with a request to communicate its decision on the issue before 5 February 1990. The government was notified that unless measures were taken in a timely manner, many labor collectives would be forced to resort to the USSR Law "On Procedures for Settling Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)."

The issue should be considered very soon at a meeting of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers. On the eve of this, USSR Minister of Finance V.S. Pavlov argued, or rather tried to argue, in an interview to the central television and the newspaper PRAVDA that the price increase is justified and serves only to promote economical operations.

V.S. Pavlov maintained that increases in the freight transportation rates will generate funds for the Ministry of Railways [MPS] to purchase rolling stock and upgrade material and technical facilities. However, let us listen to railroad personnel themselves.

N.K. Isingarin, chief of the Alma-Ata Railroad, says: "We take 400 million rubles [R] from our customers. However, these funds are spent from the center. Supposedly, they will buy cars and diesel engines for us. Give us the money, and we will buy them ourselves." In a word, it has been calculated that the industry will get virtually nothing due to the increase in tariffs.

In his interview, the minister of finance returned many times to the idea that the arbitrary tariff increase which is not associated with a reform of wholesale prices amounts to developing market relations. However, what market relations are these if, for example, according to the data of I.I. Kostuykov, chairman of the Central Committee of the Metallurgical Industry Workers Union, in this industry alone more than 50 large enterprises have been transferred to the unprofitable category by a mere stroke of a pen, have lost their economic incentive funds, and will have nothing with which to pay the wages of their people. The enterprises are forced to give up leasing and economic accountability. Leasing is beside the point when you have to ask for subsidies from the state or, more precisely, from the same Ministry of Finance to make up the losses. The picture in other industries is similar.

The following argument is also made: The new prices will facilitate more economical utilization of resources. We would like to recall that the metallurgy industry mentioned above is the most energy-intensive kind of production which consumes more energy and heat that any other (a large share of power from the Bratsk Hydropower Station is claimed by one aluminum plant). Such is the technology, and for now no other is available. There is no way to economize to such a degree that they remain at the previous level. After all, it is no accident that following an appeal to the government by the AUCCTU, the Ministry of Finance was forced to agree to make up some of the losses to a number of enterprises of metallurgy, the construction materials industry, and trade. What is this? Does this show that that the decision made by the government had been profoundly justified and thought through?

Here is the opinion S.A. Arzhavkin, head of the AUCCTU Department for the Defense of the Economic Rights and Interests of Toilers: "Currently, the siphoning of funds in the opposite direction is under way. First they take the money and then they give the money back in installments to those they have taken it from in the form of forced compensation. As V.S. Pavlov thinks, all of this facilitates the development of economic independence. Actually, it undermines the belief of the people in the stability of existing norms and causes social tension."

As the employees of the Ministry of Finance state, the issue of compensation is resolved on a case-by-case basis taking into account all factors of the financial operation of enterprises. So, this is it. First, a critical situation is created, and then it is resolved with every enterprise separately. I suspect that the Ministry of Finance may have to increase its staff several-fold in this case...

Here is the main point. I am quoting Article 3 of the USSR Law "On the State Budget for 1990": "...detail the sources of financing for additional measures with a view to raising the standard of living of the populace." This is the very Article which they refer to while justifying the arbitrary decision of the government. However, it so happens that an attempt to appropriate the moneys of the collectives and allocate them for solving social problems which was, perhaps, undertaken with good intentions has hurt the standard of living of the populace. After all, the enterprises build housing and day care centers, develop communal services, and so on.

Having reduced profits, the main source of social development, the Ministry of Finance decided to repair the budget at the expense of the working man, deprived many people of prospects for receiving a dwelling, froze the construction of hospitals, day care centers, and pioneer camps. How is this supposed to benefit the people?

There are hundreds of letters, telegrams, and collective protests showing this in the editorial office, the AUCCTU, and the central committees of trade unions.

However, now is not the time for a confrontation. Cooperation and mutual understanding are necessary. The labor collectives hope that the government will find a reasonable solution.

Finance Minister Defends

904A0179A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Feb 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report on interview with USSR Minister of Finance V.S. Pavlov by Ye. Sorokin; place and date not given: "Are Price Increases Justified?"]

[Text] In recent days, a most serious conflict developed in the labor collectives of a number of industries. PRAVDA already reported this in the article "The Road to Agreement" published on 31 January. At issue is the fact that effective 1 January the government increased prices for diesel fuel, tariffs for freight transportation, and electricity rates. This decision made the financial situation of many enterprises difficult. An interbranch trade union commission of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] demanded that the government change its decision and respond by 5 February, threatening to exercise its right to approach the Supreme Soviet or resort to the USSR Law "On Procedures for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)."

What is the position of the government on this issue? A PRAVDA correspondent talked to USSR Minister of Finance V. Pavlov concerning this topic.

[Sorokin] Valentin Sergeyevich, what was the reason for this decision by the government?

[Pavlov] The economic necessity for revising the freight transportation tariffs is due primarily to well-known enormous losses in this sphere. The old tariffs were primarily tied to the gross indicator of ton/km. They did not provide incentives for the use of specialized rolling stock, increasing the load coefficient, and reducing losses in the course of transloading the freight. Besides, most of them were not revised for a long time: railway tariffs since 1955, maritime and inland waterway tariffs since 1974, and highway transportation tariffs since 1982. At the same time, prices for the rolling stock and other resources used increased substantially.

In other industries, we encounter the lack of opportunity to procure goods with the monetary funds whereas in the transportation sector, putting it bluntly, a situation which is uncommon under our conditions has emerged: There is a shortage of funds for acquiring rolling stock and resolving other issues of upgrading the material and technical facilities of the industry.

The increased prices for diesel fuel are a part of the set of measures for ensuring a turnaround in the situation with fuel and energy resources which also includes the "dieselization" of transportation. Distortions in the ratio of gasoline and diesel fuel prices also "contributed" to difficulties with motor fuels. The ratio of diesel fuel and gasoline prices commonly accepted in the world amounts to 0.8 whereas in our country it was only 0.5. This did not provide an incentive for the transportation personnel to economize.

Therefore, neither measure was aimed at "earning" something for the budget.

The increase in outlays was compensated for agriculture and special consumers; compensation to all others takes into account the assignment to save 10-20 percent of resources which is included in the plan. This is exactly what is called upon to ensure incentives for the measures being implemented.

[Sorokin] Did you expect this stormy "reaction of rejection?"

[Pavlov] We should note that the issue of increasing the tariffs and prices has been artificially blown out of proportion due to incomplete and lopsided information and the opportunistic interests of certain individuals.

The point is that this issue was discussed extensively in the course of developing the draft plan and budget for 1990, including discussions with the participation of the

AUCCTU and the people's deputies from the trade unions who are members of the Supreme Soviet. The issue even came up originally in the course of reviewing a conflict with the labor collectives of transportation workers. On no occasion were objections and remarks made anywhere.

Of course, we could have expected a certain amount of resistance because this time the revision of tariffs and prices was not accompanied by the customary changes in all plan indicators. The path of using the price as an economic-incentive device for a more efficient and rational resource utilization was opted for.

What did we do previously in cases like this? Plans provided for an increase in the revenue of the producer of goods, and these funds were fully redistributed to defray the expenditures of the consumers. As a result, both of them soon became indifferent to the new price level.

This time, we did not resort to a mechanical change in the norms of mutual relations with the budget established for the enterprises. In this manner, the price becomes an incentive for improving resource utilization, and a punishment for some inept economic managers rather than an accounting device. As far as compensation for the additional outlays which appear is concerned, this issue is resolved on a case-by-case basis, taking into account all factors of the financial operation of enterprises.

[Sorokin] What is your attitude toward the position of the AUCCTU on this issue?

[Pavlov] As a matter of fact, it means that currently the AUCCTU is coming out against the measures which are included in the plan and the budget in discussing which the AUCCTU participated at all stages of their consideration by the government and the USSR Supreme Soviet. As I have already said, these measures are aimed at increasing the efficiency of transportation operations, saving motor fuels, improving the situation of residents in rural areas by reducing their spending for electricity used in households. This position is all the more incomprehensible because the decisions made on compensation for expenditures are being carried out so that the level of remuneration for labor in the consumer industries will not be affected.

[Sorokin] The Ministry of Finance has granted payment delays to a number of enterprises and is conducting a specific analysis of the situation emerging in conjunction with the decision of the government in a number of sectors of the national economy. Is this not an indication of the fact that the decision has not been properly thought through and that they are "patching up the holes" now? Besides, could the tariffs be increased in one or two links of the chain before the reform of wholesale prices?

[Pavlov] I have already responded to the question concerning the reasons for increasing prices in what you call "one or two links." I believe that the difficulties emerging are largely associated with the fact that we are actually lagging behind in using the economic methods of management in the environment of developing goods-and-money relations compared to our declarations on this topic. This is why the use of prices and tariffs as an active regulator of economic processes in the areas where this can be effective before the overall price reform is running into resistance, as well as many other things.

As far as specific amounts of compensation are concerned, time is indeed necessary here for a diligent review in order to ensure the savings included in the plan and the budget without unjustifiably infringing upon the labor collectives. The postponement of payments which has been granted to a number of enterprises provides such an opportunity.

[Sorokin] Do you think that the trade unions are hampering our advance toward the market by their decision? What further steps will the government take? How will it respond to the demands of the trade unions?

[Pavlov] I think that we cannot cancel by any means the decision to raise the prices and the tariffs taking into account their great economic significance. The compensation for the increase to large-scale consumers will remove the main objections associated with the financial difficulties of some enterprises.

We should show our adherence to the economic methods through deeds rather than words; we should understand the practical aspect of their operation. Economic interests, not just incentives but also strict requirements for the quality of work, are the basis of the new methods. In the future, the market will present on a daily basis still more difficult tasks for the economic managers associated with saving resources in order to maintain the level of efficiency. What we need is mutual understanding and consolidation of forces rather than hesitation.

[Sorokin] Trade has turned out to be in a particularly difficult situation. The remuneration fund tax has also struck a powerful blow to it. What measures is the Ministry of Finance taking in order to improve the situation?

[Pavlov] Indeed, transportation outlays account for a higher share of the outlays of trade than, perhaps, in any other sector. The increase in outlays is due to the increase in tariffs; this is why we resorted to compensation. The funds needed have been transferred to the Tsentrosoyuz [Central Union of Consumer Societies] and in the case of state-run trade to the republics because the main segment of enterprises in this sector has mutual relations with the republic and local budgets. As far as the tax on increments in the remuneration fund is concerned, trade has been exempt from it provided that a justified ratio of increments in sales and in the remuneration fund obtains.

[Begin PRAVDA editorial note] As we can see, the positions of the trade unions and the government are diametrically opposite. The government is stating: "The decision is thought out and justified." "It nips in the bud the social programs of many labor collectives," argues the AUCCTU. It looks like a dramatic conflict is imminent which is so undesirable in our complex time. The deadline set in the trade union ultimatum is 5 February. It looks like neither the AUCCTU nor the Ministry of Finance are about to back off. It seems that the government did not take into account how acute the situation is; nobody came to the last meeting of the trade union commission from either the Council of Ministers or the State Planning Committee. This inflamed passions still more, and the familiar breeze of strikes is already blowing in some places.

It is completely obvious that the practice of ignoring each other and communicating through letters sent to each other by special courier is a dead end. Will the partners finally sit down at the negotiating table? [end PRAVDA editorial note]

First Three Years of Joint Ventures Assessed

90UI0351A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK in Russian No 5, Jan 90 p 10

[Article by B. Tuyukin, sector head of the State Foreign Economic Committee of the USSR Council of Ministers: "Joint Ventures: The Hopes and the Actual Yield"]

[Text]Three years have passed since the government adopted resolutions on creating joint ventures. A certain amount of experience has been acquired, and the positive and negative aspects of the normative acts, instructions and other documents regulating work in a sphere of economic cooperation new for us have been revealed. Before getting down to an analysis, however—a few statistics.

Our information: At the end of 1989, 1,274 joint ventures had been created on USSR territory. Their total agreed-upon charter capital exceeds 3.3 billion rubles, including 1.4 billion rubles as the share of the foreign participants. The largest number of joint ventures have been created with capitalist countries such as the FRG—191, Finland—146, United States—143, Great Britain—84, Austria—90 and Italy—83.

In 1989 joint ventures produced and sold about 800 million rubles worth of products and services. Approximately 94 million rubles worth of them were exported, including 70 million rubles in convertible currency. Some 181.6 million rubles were received in the USSR, about half of which went for consumer goods.

One more small addendum, which makes it possible to trace the trends in creating the ventures. Over 59.3 percent of the ventures have charter capital of up to 1 million rubles; 27.6 percent—from 1 to 5 million; six percent—from 5 to 10 million; only 7.1 percent—over 10 million rubles.

Some 400 joint ventures have been created in the social sector. Of them, only 122 enterprises produced consumer goods; and the rest were engaged in trade and public catering, in hotel, transport and concert spheres, in public health, and in the production and sale of movie and video products. Some 341 enterprises performed scientific-research and experimental design work, offering engineering and consulting-mediatory services, and engaged in personnel training. There were 62 enterprises engaged in machine building and instrument making, 61 in the agroindustrial complex, and 98 in construction and building materials production. Some 166 ventures developed programs and produced computer equipment.

This is the overall picture, which gives food for thought and conclusions. It can be said that a fair start has been made in using mixed forms of industrial-economic cooperation. It is, of course, still too early to evaluate the effectiveness of joint ventures, since their potential is only just beginning to be discovered. Only a short time has passed since they began to appear, but this short period has revealed a number of unsolved organizational, legal, financial and other problems.

At least two of them are attracting particular attention: What is hindering the creation in our country of joint ventures capable of solving serious economic problems, and what could be done to ensure normal material-technical supply for these enterprises?

Let us begin with the fact that the Soviet enterprises participating in joint ventures should allot material, financial, labor and other resources to develop them. Are they interested in this, however, if the results of the work of the joint ventures are not taken into account for them in fulfilling their plan, and this means they are in no way reflected in the results of economic activity? It is no wonder that among many directors of Soviet enterprises, the question arises: Why, as a matter of fact, separate ourselves and give up production areas, equipment and trained personnel and take on extra trouble and responsibility? It is precisely this that in many ways accounts for the development of primarily small and very small joint ventures, which do not require appreciable material and financial contributions for their development. In fact, though, at first our ministries and state enterprises entered into the setting up of medium-sized and even relatively large joint ventures. After that, this tendency declined considerably. For example, among the first 100 registered, there were 29 mixed enterprises with a charter capital of over 5 million rubles, in the third 100 there were 12, and in the eighth 100 there were only four.

Without in any way minimizing the role of small enterprises, which have the right to exist and may be useful, it should probably be acknowledged that our country still has too few medium-sized and large enterprises capable of solving the more or less serious problems of our economic system. After all, according to the plan, we would like to have quite powerful, efficient enterprises, and not handicraft workshops with 20-30 workers.

The approach to setting up and registering joint ventures should, evidently, be different. After all, those that have minimal charter capital are in a number of cases essentially not joint ventures, but are actually unsanctioned representatives of foreign firms in our country. Should their organization be furthered? Can a minimal permissible limit be established for the charter capital of joint ventures? In our opinion, it should be at least 500,000-800,000 rubles, and the share of the foreign participants set at least 25 percent. In the process, if the participants in the joint venture do not invest at least 30 percent of their funds in its capital, the enterprise cannot be considered effective. At the same time, the possibility and expediency of setting up large joint ventures—with the total amount of capital investments over 70-100 million rubles—should obviously be coordinated with USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and the councils of ministers of the union republics.

Practical experience suggests to us that the creation of joint ventures should be regarded as part of the overall investment process being carried out in our economic system. Obviously, it is expedient to determine at the state level in which rayons and sectors they should be set up, and to allot land parcels, buildings and structures, machines and equipment and building materials, as well as financial resources; but not through the funds and quotas of the corresponding sectors. The property of some of the 9,000 unprofitable enterprises could be used for this purpose, as well as many of the building projects that have been temporarily shut down in which quite large funds have already been invested.

The conclusion inevitably arises, from what has been said, that apparently, there must be organizations of an intersectorial state association type, the purpose and meaning of existence of which would be creating and ensuring the activity of the joint ventures, and a competent solution to the entire complex of corresponding technical, commercial, economic, legal and other problems. Each of them could have a share in the capital of 30-40 joint ventures. They could be given a yearly allotment of raw material, materials and equipping items and on a cost-balanced basis, the output from the joint ventures could be ordered from them.

Now, a few words on the material-technical supply of joint ventures. When examining this important problem it should be kept in mind that, in accordance with the existing legislature, our state organs are not establishing compulsory planning assignments for the joint ventures and, consequently, raw material, materials and completing items are not specified and not allotted in the plans. Soviet state enterprises may give them only surplus products, produced above the state order or above the supplies for traditional consumers.

Things are not going well with prices, either. The point is that the joint ventures can acquire goods and sell their products either for rubles or for currency. When raw material is sold for currency, the Soviet state supplying enterprise retains for itself all the currency proceeds, since these transactions are considered intra-union. The joint venture sells the products manufactured from this raw material abroad. As a result, our country's budget has no currency receipts from these operations.

This is not all. Joint ventures not only bring nothing into the state coffers from the currency earned, they also receive unjustifiably high, to put it plainly, speculative profits in rubles. Indeed, just evaluate this sort of operation: An enterprise pays for raw material, materials and completing items in rubles at internal wholesale prices, but sells the manufactured goods at prices higher than the retail.

All of this has an adverse effect on our state budget, if, in addition, you take into consideration the fact that we have signed intergovernment agreements with many states on mutual protection of capital investments. This means that we have taken on the obligation of guaranteeing, when necessary, a conversion—the conversion of the ruble funds of the joint venture into currency to be converted abroad. As we know, we have set ourselves the task of bringing domestic wholesale prices into line with world market prices. On this basis, should we not now, in our relations with joint ventures, be guided by these prices in material-technical supply and when purchasing their finished products?

What does this give us? Quite a lot. Let us begin if only with the fact that the new approach will ensure an equivalency of exchange such that with foreign firms the conditions will be created for us to be able to foresee the development of joint entrepreneurship independent of inflationary, directive and other price changes in the USSR. This will also make it possible to compare the competitiveness of conditions for the activity of joint ventures in the USSR and in other countries interested in attracting foreign investments. Moreover, a joint venture can obtain profit comparable to the profit of analogous foreign firms, and demonstrate a real ability to compete with them.

It would be advisable to make estimates for joint ventures with Soviet enterprises and organizations for raw material, materials and completing items, as is done when supplying them for export (that is, partly in rubles and partly in foreign currency). In this case, considering the easier conditions for selling the goods of the joint ventures (common language, long-term transactions) as compared with supplying abroad, the proportion of payments in foreign currency cannot exceed 25 percent of the norm established for the export of the corresponding product.

The considerations that have been set forth here make no claim to indisputability, but it is possible that, along with other ideas, they could to a certain extent contribute to leading the development of joint entrepreneurship onto the path that we have outlined.

Candidate Questions Value of Five-Year Plans

PM1202160390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Letter from reader Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Tarasov, laboratory chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Machine Building Institute's Gorkiy Branch, under the rubric "I Stand By This...": "Why We Need Another Five-Year Plan"]

[Text] Appearing on TV 8 January 1990, Yu. Maslyukov, chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] cited the great work which will be done by enterprises, ministries, the Gosplan, and the government to prepare the draft 13th Five-Year Plan by 1 September. Indeed, thousands of people will be involved with this work. But do we need it?

We are now living under the 12th Five-Year Plan and we can see that the plan exists by itself and life proceeds by itself. This is not due to a lack of zeal on anyone's part to fulfill plan targets. It is a reflection of a universal law. Even for relatively simple technical systems, the laws of whose functioning have been well studied, it is impossible to predict their behavior in the future for sufficiently long periods of time. That is a fundamental provision established by modern science, and it is explained by inevitable errors in initial data and the growth of those errors in the course of calculations associated with predicting the future.

The thesis that it is impossible to predict the future is all the more accurate when applied to society as a whole and to the economy in particular, since the laws of development are known to be far worse than in technical systems. All the more so since, as Yu. Maslyukov himself said, initial data for planning in the form of economic normatives is still unknown and will be established only in February by central economic departments. It is clear that its importance will not be ideal, since the normatives will be established on the basis of the current situation, whereas nobody knows the situation which will emerge in a few years.

The year 1989 showed that the economic situation is changing very quickly. The government was forced to make important economic decisions to control the situation. Under the pressure of life the edifice of the 12th Five-Year Plan collapsed. Why work uselessly to erect a new edifice which is doomed from the outset? Why fence in the new five-year plan?

The reluctance to abandon the concept of five-year planning clearly results from the habit, if not the necessity, of involving a vast army of planning officials. Planning in the USSR also has purely ideological functions. The adoption of plans and all kinds of programs, and the fuss that is raised about them make it possible to remove social tension for a certain time. But when the euphoria linked with the adoption of another plan diminishes, new plans are adopted. All this is reminiscent of the behavior of an alcoholic who, in order to get over one drinking bout, starts another. It is time to grit our teeth, get through the hangover, and sober up once and for all.

In my view, instead of total planning there should be forecasting, which would show us a picture of the future based on careful scientific analysis of the existing situation and its development trends. Such forecasts would make it possible to elaborate measures of state regulation in order to overcome negative trends. Naturally, planning should be retained for specific projects unconnected with five-year plans or other calendar limits.

[Signed] Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Tarasov, laboratory chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Machine Building Institute's Gorkiy Branch. Gorkiy.

Ukraine Economy Changes to High-Tech Output

PM1202151390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Unidentified own correspondent: "Ukraine's Economy Changes Course"]

[Text] A press conference has been held at the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers at which news of by no means local importance was reported: The republic's economy has slowly but surely started changing the course it had followed for many decades of mainly supplying the country with ore, metal, coal, and other raw materials. Realizing that the further growth of these sectors will inevitably lead to ecological disaster in the republic, a new development course has been chosen geared to the production of high-tech output and the expansion of precision machine-building and instrument-making. The first result of the implementation of this idea is that production of complex household equipment in the republic this year will increase by 1.2 billion rubles. This figure represents mainly VCR's, radio cassette recorders, microwave ovens, and TV satellite dishes.

The main suppliers of this hard-to-come-by consumer equipment will be defense industry enterprises. Their efforts are currently focused on starting series production of a new miniature motor.

The development of personal computer production also looks hopeful. The Ukraine has decided to set up its own joint-stock company. Within three years it will be producing 1 million personal computers.

Now the "highlight" of the press conference: the creation of a Ukrainian motor vehicle association—"AvtoZAZ." It is planned that the association's enterprises will produce up to 400,000-500,000 cars a year on the basis of the current "Tavriya" and another promising model.

As for the renewal of the republic's traditional industries—such as metallurgy and coal mining—which affect the environment particularly strongly, their growth has to all intents and purposes been suspended. As a result, customers are being geared to the chemists' output. The latest example is the construction in the republic of a polypropylene production installation with a capacity of 150,000 metric tons a year. It will replace—no more, no less—1.5 metric tons of metal. These examples inspire a certain optimism.

Positive Trends Seen Despite Statistical Downturn

PM1202170190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 1

[From the "Statistics and Our Commentary" column by V. Romanyuk: "Beginning of the Year: Panic Stations Again?"]

[Text] The USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] has summarized the preliminary results for January 1990. The general conclusion which emerges from the brief statistics sent in from the oblasts and republics is that there has been no fundamental breakthrough in industry. Furthermore, compared with January 1989, production volumes have fallen by one percent. Contract commitments have been fulfilled by only 98 percent (in January 1989 the figure was 98.9 percent). The situation is better in the fuel and energy complex (98.8 percent) and the metallurgical and machine building complex (98.3 percent), but worse in the chemicals and timber complex (97 percent) and light industry (97.1 percent).

I asked V. Tolkushkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Goskomstat, to comment on these figures, and he highlighted the following specific features. First, the aggravation of the situation in the Transcaucasian republics. In Azerbaijan production fell by 38 percent compared with January 1989, while in Armenia it fell by 16 percent. Consumers had a shortfall of tens of thousands of electric motors, a large quantity of electric deep-well pumps, rubber for cable production, and many other goods not produced anywhere else in the country. Second, there was a reduction in production volumes due to the conversion of military production: Defense programs are being cut back but civilian production is developing slowly. Third, the lack of environmental safeguards at production units took its toll. More than 1,000 large enterprises stopped work by public demand last year, and this process continued in January 1990. Fourth, income tax acted as a brake. Many enterprises, lacking an incentive to increase production, adopted smaller plans than their capacities and real potential allowed. Adjustments have now been introduced into the taxation procedure: Additional scope for wages is allowed for increasing production, and corresponding sanctions are envisaged for reducing it.

The production rhythm is an indicator of economic health. Unfortunately, in many sectors the production rhythm was extremely erratic. Take machine building as an example. Whereas in the first 20 days of January, 3,659 metal-cutting machine tools were produced, in the final 10 days production was 5,380 or 60 percent of the monthly program. The third 10 days of January accounted for 47 percent of the monthly bearing production program, 55 percent of the excavators (including 74 percent at the "Talleks" plant and 87 percent from the Donetsk excavator plant), and 44 percent of the electric motors for household appliances. We often hear complaints about the shortage of mainline freightcars. The final 10 days of January accounted for 55 percent of the monthly program while the Altay freightcar plant produced 69 percent of its monthly target. The Kalinin railroad car production association "did" the entire month's program for mainline passenger cars in the final 10 days. The same happened at other enterprises, too, mainly because of interruptions to component supplies. It is not hard to imagine the strain that a collective must be working under after a long and often enforced delay at the start of the month.

The state of consumer goods production requires a special comment. As is well known, a target has been set for this year: An increase of 66 billion rubles must be achieved. And definite improvements in this sphere have been achieved in January. This was aided by the establishment of state orders backed up by resources, the introduction of extra incentives, and quite simply overt administrative pressure. Washing machine production rose by 14 percent in January (compared with January 1989), tape recorder production rose 18 percent, bicycle production increased by 13 percent, color televisions were up by 14 percent, production of batteries rose by 17 percent, and production of bath and household soap increased by 12-13 percent. The situation regarding the production of scarce commodities was strictly monitored. As a result the production of irons rose by 10 percent, exercise book production rose by seven percent, production of pressed aluminum tableware rose by 15 percent, panty hose production rose by 36 percent, and compact cassette production increased by 37 percent...

But even here there were considerable disruptions. For example, motorcycle production actually fell by four percent and rubber footwear was down by three percent: Less leather footwear was produced, too, including footwear for children, young people, and the elderly. Production of prime necessities was less than in January last year, pencil production fell by 11 percent, razor blades have fallen by five percent, Russian-style and conventional cigarette production fell eight percent, production of terry towels was down by three percent, and there was a two percent drop in toothpaste output.

The work of enterprises involved in production of consumer goods in January was erratic. For example, 47.2 percent of the monthly washing machine target was produced in the final 10 days of the month. The Riga electrical machine building plant produced 49 percent of its monthly target in that same period, while the Frunze experimental electric vacuum machinery plant achieved 74 percent. The final 10-day period accounted for 47.2 percent of television sets of all makes, 54 percent of tape recorders, and 52.7 percent of radio receivers.

Be that as it may, the planned leap forward in consumer goods production has still not been fully achieved. The positive trends that have been observed in this sphere must be developed to the utmost. First and foremost by strengthening supply discipline and making better use of those opportunities for growth offered by the new economic mechanism.

Kucherenko Discusses Drafting of Law on Taxation

904A0176A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report on interview with V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the permanent Planning and Budgetary Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by M. Buzhkevich in Moscow; date not given: "What Are We Paying For?"]

[Text]**The person being interviewed today is Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko, chairman of the permanent Planning and Budgetary Commission of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet—he is an experienced person with a wealth of knowledge. Educated as an engineer, he worked a number of years in metallurgical enterprises, and, following this, he held responsible positions in party and soviet organs. When he was elected a USSR people's deputy last spring, he was chairman of the Donetsk oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee]. M. Buzhkevich, who is PRAVDA's parliamentary columnist, met with Viktor Grigoryevich on the 15th floor of the tall building on Kalinin Avenue to discuss problems in the establishment of a taxation system. We offer the readers an abbreviated record of the dialogue.**

[Buzhkevich] The third session of the Supreme Soviet starts on 14 February. Will it be more successful than the previous ones?

[Kucherenko] In my opinion, it should be the most effective, because we have come right down to the adoption of extremely important economic, social, and legal laws. They are now being talked about and debated a lot. These are laws about property, land, the socialist enterprise, local self-government and the local economy, the provision of pensions, about vacations, and others. They are so interrelated and affect each other to such an extent that they literally cannot exist separately. I would also add the law on taxation to them.

[Buzhkevich] In your opinion, how did the Soviet system of taxation live up to its purpose—did it always work for the welfare of the people and the development of the productive and spiritual forces of society?

[Kucherenko] Frankly speaking, no. Because we do not yet have a real, scientifically based taxation system. We—I have in mind the government and our commission—are just beginning to erect its foundation. Any civilized state is responsible to its citizens for the establishment of the necessary minimum of social protection, and a specific level of life, culture, and science. And a socialist state has especially great obligations in this. In the meantime, seemingly guided at times by high purposes, it frequently dipped its hand deeply into the pocket of one enterprise, while not touching the incomes of others. There is no denying that far from popular taxes exist in our country to the present day, including those being collected from the population.

Here I would like to make an observation which, in my opinion, is important. When it comes to taxes, more accurately to the purposes for which they are levied, not everything is as simple as it seems at first glance. The draft laws on the income tax that are being proposed and the tax on the profit and income of enterprises do not increase revenues. Rather it is the other way around—they reduce them by several billions of rubles. But in exchange we acquire a balanced and socially weighed system of taxation. As a result, a redistribution will occur: from the rich to the poor, from a poorly operating enterprise to the successfully functioning one. Laws have to be introduced with intelligence, with subtle economic, political, and social calculations. And here it is very important to find a point of dynamic equilibrium. A tax should, on the one hand, noticeably replenish the treasury of a society, and, on the other hand, it should raise the work and creative activity of the taxpayer, whether the taxpayer is an individual worker or a whole enterprise; and it should reinforce the taxpayer's interest in increasing productivity, the volume of products produced, and the growth in income.

[Buzhkevich] And you succeeded in finding this golden mean?

[Kucherenko] This is our main concern and the main difficulty. Our commission has been working for three months on the principles of taxation on instructions of the Supreme Soviet. We have succeeded in some things, but we are still not near the finish line. In my opinion, the law on the income tax from citizens is practically ready. Work is being completed on the Law on Taxes on the Income and Profit of Enterprises and Organizations.

[Buzhkevich] You have in mind its draft that was published for general discussion? It seems to me that there will still be considerable difficulties with it. I understand the concepts of the authors of these proposals: adhere to social justice and ease the situation of those with low salaries. However, here, in my opinion, an apparent timidity surfaces. The minimal wage on which an income will not be levied is 80 rubles [R]. Is not that overly modest? But why not start to take such a tax at R100? To compensate for the shortage in the treasury, introduce a progressive tax, not starting at R700, as is now proposed, but at R500 or even R400.

[Kucherenko] The affirmation of social justice is a very complicated and even painful process. I have already said what has to be done to assure such justice: The task here is simple and straightforward—take from the rich (i.e., from the one who has more) and give to the poor. It is obvious that those who will receive will be silent or will be grateful for the help. But those who will lose will protest—and very loudly through the press and through their deputies. Our task consists exactly in the preparation of a just law and, in doing this, not to make many people unhappy. At the same time, to abolish the outdated withholding from people's wages, like the notorious "childless" tax.

The draft proposes not to impose a tax on earnings up to R80. However, there are proposals, and our commission is inclined to support them, to raise this level. We discussed this variant with the financial experts. They assert that this will create a gap in the budget of up to R2 billion, which it is difficult to fill now. And, nonetheless, such a proposal is very tempting, because it helps people who are poorly situated. Therefore, we will continue the joint quest with the Ministry of Finance to raise the nontaxable minimum to R90.

Now about the progressive income tax. I will remind you that 13 percent is taken from earnings. Further, according to this scale, the withholding increases, especially after the 1,200-ruble line. And here our commission evaluated a government proposal, not behind closed doors, but in consultation with scientists and specialists, and it studied proposals contained in letters from the readers. They considered how to compensate for such losses if there will be a monthly tax on pay starting from R400 or R500 on a progressive scale. It turns out splendidly from the standpoint of financial experts—the budget is not reduced. But in doing this, as it became clear, the interests of workers from a number of leading branches of the national economy suffer: coal, metallurgy, transport, and others that have a monthly salary of R400-R600, and, with benefits, R1,000 and more. It appears that the material interests of tens of millions of people will be infringed upon and on whose labor the economic well-being of the country is maintained.

[Buzhkevich] I recall that deputies and representatives of unions of creative workers spoke at a session of the Supreme Soviet and protested against the application of this scale to their earnings. I had the impression that they were right. You cannot speed up the creative process under rational, even if quite fair, calculations, norms, and rules. Have you had a dialogue with representatives of such unions?

[Kucherenko] Yes, we met. Recently, three detailed talks were held. N. Gubenko, the minister of culture of the country, and People's Deputies Ch. Aytmatov and K. Lavrov, and other writers, artists, and painters, took part in them. Actually, a novelist could be writing a book for several years. After receiving, for example, R60,000 for it, according to the progressive scale, he returns half in the form of an income tax. This seems unfair to us and to our "opponents." We are now searching for a way out. It would be possible to pay the honorarium annually in parts, for example R10,000, then the withholding will be "fair."

[Buzhkevich] Speaking of an integral system of taxation, no less attention should be given to the law on deductions from profits and incomes of enterprises. It is these deductions that are the main source for covering state expenditures for the development of the economy, health services, education, culture, science, etc. At the same time, as I know, there is no system here. Moreover, there are enterprises and public organizations that do not give the state one kopeck. And this also is a manifestation of that very same social injustice.

[Kucherenko] You are right. When we began the work on the law on taxation of the incomes of enterprises, organizations and establishments—and it is also as important in the system of taxation as the law on the income tax on citizens, we asked the financial experts to familiarize us with what income is not taxed by the state. And we received a three-page list, starting with publishing houses belonging to party organs, various enterprises of the trade unions and the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and ending with the society of beekeepers. Can there really be such a system of taxation in a legal socialist state?

Therefore, we decided to introduce a general principle that was obligatory for all enterprises and organizations: You receive income—give a firmly established part to the state.

[Buzhkevich] But, permit me, Viktor Grigoryevich, such a law deprives major enterprises like VAZ [Volga Automobile Plant], the Magnitogorsk metallurgical combine, and others like this, of an interest in the development of new equipment, the introduction of advanced technology, and the construction of housing and cultural and communal facilities. At the same time, in this sense, "sickly" plants and factories also will not make their way—deductions from them will remain as before.

[Kucherenko] A mechanism of benefits has been built into the draft Law on the Taxation of Enterprises. If a plant maintains housing, a school, a recreation center, expands the output of consumer goods, and expends resources on ecological needs—its deductions from income are decreased accordingly. If you work better, you will have an opportunity to resolve the economic and social tasks of the work collective quicker.

[Buzhkevich] The question was raised more than once in the press and in sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet about the level of deductions from the incomes of enterprises in the state budget. Many assert that the share of such deductions is too big. Managers of Soviet organs are disturbed by the ratio of quotas for union and republic budgets. The implementation of cost accounting at the level of a union republic requires, naturally, increases in expenditures for its own needs.

[Kucherenko] First, about the general level of deductions. The government draft recommends that they be on the order of 60 percent of the incomes of enterprises. In discussions in commissions, we saw some opportunities to lower this level by two-three percent. In the end, we agreed on 55 percent—a single accounting rate scale. I will add that payments of enterprises into a centralized fund of the ministries are completely excluded, and their apparatuses will now be maintained at the expense of the state budget.

And what does the experience of the most developed industrial powers say in this respect? In the United States, for example, the size of deductions from the income of companies in the state budget is 44 percent. If our enterprise will be able to use all benefits, which permit it to reduce the share of such deductions, then it will be approximately on a level with its American colleagues. However, something else should be kept in mind. The social obligations of the Soviet state to the people is significantly higher than in the capitalist countries. To achieve the desired level of prosperity for the Soviet people, high technology equipping and industrial productivity is the reason why perestroyka is going on. And since this is the case, then the deductions from enterprises for the common pot will also grow.

Our second thesis is about the ratio of deductions in the all-union and republic funds. The USSR Council of Ministers proposed returning the following: of the 60 percent, 35 percent to the center and 25 percent to the republics. It is most likely that these figures will be adjusted. I, like many of my colleagues, am for sending more resources to the localities. They are more visible there, and so is what they are being expended for.

[Buzhkevich] Articles appear in the press of many foreign countries concerning scandalous stories associated with the concealment of incomes by industrial companies for the purpose of reducing the payment of taxes to the state. In general, the basic criterion there of the political and moral cleanliness of any person, especially of a political scientist and a businessman, is the "sterility" of his account in the bank and absolute honesty in the payment of taxes. A violation of this taboo cost many their political and business careers. Although there are quite a few examples also of how cunningly the "facade" canons of civilized society are disregarded. Do you not fear that in our country as well there will be quite a few clever dealers who will find cracks in the system to conceal their own incomes, and the profits of their own cooperative?

[Kucherenko] Of course, this is not excluded. With citizens it is simple. Make a purchase that costs more than R10,000, you must fill out a declaration about sources of income. It is another matter with shifty economic managers. Some can write off expenditures for the development of production that has nothing to do with the business. How do you catch somebody doing this? Now a special inspection for monitoring the income of enterprises and organizations in the country is being created. I hope that it will be able to protect the interests of the people and the state.

While working on this law, the commission heard the remarks of representatives of a number of republics and oblasts. The proposals of national economic complexes, committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and letters from workers were taken into considerations.

We are continuing this work, understanding what complexities and contradictory opinions the law will evoke. But we have to go through this, if we are to have as a goal the intensification of economic reform.

Kazakhistan 1989 Economic Results Examined

LD1202214190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jan 90

[Text] A session of the Council of Ministers of Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic examined the results of fulfillment of the state plan for economic and social development and the budget of the republic for 1989 since the beginning of the current five-year-plan period.

Last year featured further advance of the economic reform in sectors of the national economy, expansion of the initiative and autonomy of the labor collectives in drafting and implementation of plans of socioeconomic development.

Despite the existing difficulties, the 1989 results exceed the analogous indices for the last five-year-plan period. A certain stability was achieved in supplying the population with food, the production of which increased by one-quarter. This is 17 percent higher than the average annual index for the 11th five-year-plan period. This was greatly promoted by the transition of agricultural enterprises to the new conditions of management. The total losses per farm were reduced by 21 percent. There was a fall in the number of loss-making collective and state farms.

In industry, construction, and motor transport, labor productivity increased. In the last four years the rates of growth sharply exceeded the targets of the five-year-plan period. The growth in volume of output was obtained mainly from the growth in labor productivity. Production of consumer goods, paid services to the population, and the commissioning of above-plan housing were increased. There was an improvement in the construction of children's school and preschool institutions, hospitals, polyclinics, out-patient clinics, and veterans' homes.

The increase in the national income amounted to 8.7 percent against three percent for the same period of the last five-year-plan period. The average annual growth in profit reached 17.5 percent, while in the 11th five-year-plan period it equalled only one percent.

These indices, speakers noted, show a dynamism in the development of the economy. The main task is not only to maintain the positions achieved, but also to make these processes continuous and irreversible. For this, what is needed is careful, painstaking, harmonious work of all ministries, departments, scientific organizations and labor collectives. The basis of this work must be the concept of republican financial autonomy. Economic levers must be introduced more boldly, and a search must be made for new ways to improve the activity of all sectors of the national economy.

Instructions on the questions discussed were given to the heads of ministries and departments and oblast executive committees. The session was chaired by Karamanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic. Anufriyev, second secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan, took part in the session.

Tula Ammunition Plant Sets Conversion Example

PM1202153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent A. Pushkar report: "Tula-Style Conversion"]

[Text] The "Shtampa" collective—the country's oldest defense plant, which was previously a cartridge plant—has assimilated production of seven types of consumer goods.

The squat brick buildings built here 110 years ago are still there. Alongside are more modern and brighter shops. But inside... Whole sections have stopped work. Rows of machine presses are idle. There are piles of scrap metal here and there—dismantling is under way.

"We had expected conversion," Plant Director V. Mitin said. "And yet when it happened in July it was like a bolt from the blue. Just imagine what it means for a plant that produces output in massive quantities to be deprived of 60 percent of its state orders. And anyone who thinks that the same equipment that makes ammunition can be used to produce consumer goods is wrong. We need to retool, look for suppliers, and design new products."

Some 700 people have left the plant. Of these, 400 were pensioners and 300 were frequent absentees and violators of labor discipline. The backbone has been retained, but as soon as the order came to change the state plan, the engineering and technical workers switched to a different working procedure. The plant still works three shifts. Samovar production has increased to 1.8 million a year. A training school and a decorative painting section have been organized.

The defense plant, perhaps because it has always made time-honored and elegant products, has retained a taste for beautiful things—which cannot be said about most of our enterprises, which manufacture consumer goods hastily and carelessly. The inexpensive but attractive "old-style" chandelier is pleasing on the eye. The "Uyut" nickel and blue domestic electric radiator, designed by plant engineers V. Koryakin and S. Malevskiy, is brilliant. The Volgins, a father-and-son team of masters craftsmen well-known in Tula who used to decorate samovars, worked on its design.

Thanks to a subsidy of 30 million rubles [R] the collective has not lost any earnings. Conversion has also helped to solve social problems.

It has also been possible to accelerate construction of housing—whose decoration the entire plant is involved, and to "pull up" the waiting list for apartments from the year 1961 to 1975. Construction of a long-postponed part of the plant—the dispensary—has been completed. The collective has used the foreign currency produced by the samovars to buy imported medical equipment.

Last year the plant manufactured consumer goods worth R87 million, this year it will be R120 million, and by 1992 its output will be worth R220 million.

Quality Inspection Ends at Kemerovo Oblast Plants

18200488 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 11 Feb 90 p 1

[Article by V. Antonov: "Farewell, Gospriyemka!"]

[Text] State quality inspection [gospriyemka] has been discontinued at eight of the largest industrial enterprises of Kemerovo Oblast.

The directors of the center for standardization and metrology have recognized its introduction as a mistake, which has not provided the expected effect. Three hundred inspectors have lost their jobs. Many of them cannot return to their former work places because their jobs are filled.

The intention to increase the quality of goods and to improve the economy by administrative methods has suffered yet another blow. In the next two-three years, gospriyemka will cease to exist at the oblast's remaining ten enterprises.

Soviet Organizations May Abandon Fiat Contract

LD1202141590 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 12 Feb 90

[Text] Soviet organizations taking part in building an automobile factory in the city of Yelabuga might give up the contract with the Italian Fiat concern, which seems to have offered an outdated model. This is reported by the Moscow weekly KOMMERSANT. The model was designed in Italy 20 years ago and is now being taken of the production line. The factory that is going up on the Kama River has run against many difficulties. Among the chief ones is financing the project. It is being therefore suggested to attract people's savings and the funds of different organizations to the building of the new factory. They could become its shareholders.

Lithuanian Official Views Cut in Meat Deliveries

904D0057A Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Feb 90 p 2

[Report by G. Konchyus and V. Shchurov: "Meat 'Blockade'"]

[Text] In the sphere of concerns in connection with our daily bread we are, it would seem, being drawn irresistibly toward coupons, commissions, ration cards, and other attributes of the distributive economy. In Siberian cities or, let us assume, in Estonia the people are already accustomed to going to the stores with calling cards and identification cards, and inhabitants of Leningrad have this year set about mastering this, if you'll excuse the expression, method. Meat can no longer be purchased in local food stores with a city residence stamp, and it is evidently not just for the sake of it that visitors are henceforth denied this product. At a recent meeting in the capital a Leningrad worker accused his Baltic neighbors of impeding supplies of meat to the city. We turned to specialists to clarify this clearly abnormal situation.

"Reproaches leveled at us require explanation," Y. Yagminas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, said. "It is correct that the Baltic republics, Lithuania included, have reduced supplies of meat to all-union stocks. But only someone who is viewing the problem one-sidedly could call this a 'blockade'.

"The realities are as follows. There has recently been an abrupt deterioration in the provision of the countryside with equipment, spare parts, and forage grain. Thus, the Dnepropetrovsk and Kharkov, Volgograd and Kishinev plants failed to ship us on time 184 tractors, and requests for excavators, motor vehicles, and agricultural equipment have not been supplied. It is not surprising that people have been asking: Why must we fulfill our obligations if our partners are not keeping their word? Let us consider also that, according to the plan, Lithuania ships outside of the republic every second or third kg of meat and that there is a shortage of the latter on the domestic market.

"All this served as a reason for the republic short-supplying all-union stocks to the extent of 31,000 tons of meat. In response, the USSR Council of Ministers reduced supplies of forage grain from state resources by 123,000 tons. Nor is this all. For the current year the government has adopted the decision to cut the planned formula food supplies by a further 195,000 tons. So what, then, are we to wind down animal husbandry?

"Let not Leningrad workers think that we are overjoyed at this prospect. A cutback in production at the livestock units will weaken the economy and complicate the solution of social problems in the countryside. In addition, the Ministry of Trade has warned that in connection with the shortfalls in the supplies of meat the republic will receive less coffee, tea, and other hard-currency commodities. We recently requested that the USSR Council of Ministers restore the plans for the sale of forage grain. Otherwise we will lose 20,000 tons of meat and 165,000 tons of milk annually. And this constitutes 10 and 12 percent respectively of the shipment of these products to all-union stocks."

"The root of the problem lies in the decline in contract discipline," we were told by G. Cholokyan, deputy chief of an administration of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, who handles meat supplies. "By last fall even many regions were falling thousands and tens of thousands of tons of meat short in their supplies to all-union stocks. What to do? Inasmuch as command methods have outlived their time, economic means for pressuring unconscientious suppliers had to be found. As an experiment, our commission proposed in the fourth quarter a reduction in the shipments of forage grain to those who were hampering supplies of meat to state resources. Incidentally, in the event of fulfillment of the contract commitments, provision was made for restoration of the feed in full. Thus Russia had by the end of the year made good its meat 'arrears,' and is receiving forage. As for the Baltic republics, Moldavia, Kazakhstan, and Belorussia, this train carrying formula has left, as they say.

"Further, despite the good harvest, 27 million tons of grain less than last year arrived at the elevators. It was for this reason also that the above-mentioned Council of Ministers decision on a reduction in supplies of forage grain for the current year was adopted. As in the first case, the logic is understandable. If you ship less meat, you will receive less feed also. If you keep the grain for yourself, do not claim state forage resources. After all, the latter cannot be replenished from imports ad infinitum.

"Of course, these decisions do not, nor can they as yet, take account of the entire complex of interregional relations. Some people will refer to the shortage of agricultural equipment or the high level of supplies of a product for the state resources, some people will explain the supply shortfalls by the low level of per capita meat consumption.... I agree that everything needs to be taken into account—in order to scientifically substantiate and regulate the partners' relations. And our scientists are already working on this. But it needs to be recognized that this is an exceptionally complex business and, of course, goes far beyond the framework of the meat problem. It is a question, no more, no less, of a mechanism of the regulation of relations under conditions of regional financial autonomy. But since we have to live under these conditions, we will have to accustom ourselves to economic penalties also. Without them, I repeat, contract discipline cannot be reinforced."

Our comments: An odd picture, you will agree: two parties urging the fulfillment of mutual commitments, but cannot reach agreement. Is this not why, of all the possible languages, merely the language of economic penalties—some people do not supply meat, others, forage!—has been chosen. As a result we have a confrontation of local and state interests, the familiar tug of war. Given our level of specialization and given the incapacity of the devalued ruble to influence contract discipline, this path threatens to lead to impasse. Still, we believe that it is not confrontation but a search for mutual economic interests and intelligent compromise which becomes partners. Otherwise we will really be turning the cities and villages into medieval appanage principalities, where everyone lives for himself. We would then, possibly, reach the point of ration cards for all other basic necessities, of showing our identification cards when entering a restaurant....

Scientific

Reportage on Soyuz TM-9 Spacecraft Flight

Corrects Trajectory

LD1202114990 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 12 feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 12 TASS—A TASS correspondent reports from the flight control centre:

The spaceship Soyuz TM-9, manned by Anatoliy Soloveyev and Aleksandr Balandin, is continuing its flight towards the scientific research complex Mir.

The crew checked the efficiency of the spaceship's onboard systems and the compartments' air tight seal on Sunday. Two long approach maneuvers have been made.

An additional correction of the spaceship Soyuz TM-9's trajectory was made today. The parameters of its orbit are now as follows:

Maximum distance from the earth's surface—338 km,
Minimin distance from the earth's surface—297 km,
Period of revolution—90.8 minutes,
Inclination—51.6 degrees

Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksander Serebrov have spent a total of 160 days in a near-earth orbit. Today's program envisages a number of scientific-technological experiments. They will also make preparations to meet the new crew.

In accordance with the Gellar unit space materiology studies program, the cosmonauts completed a technological experiment, begun on February 6, to obtain a semi-conductor material gallium arsenide in microgravitation conditions.

The cosmonauts Viktorenko, Serebrov, Solovev and Balandin feel fine. The Soyuz-9 spaceship is planned to dock with the Mir complex at 9.4, February 13.

Soyuz TM-9, Mir Dock Smoothly

LD1302072690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 13 Feb 90

[Excerpt] The docking of the Soyuz TM-9 with the Mir orbital complex was carried out some minutes ago. Vladimir Bezyayev, our special correspondent at the Flight Control center, gives more details.

[Bezyayev] Yes, this took place at 09 hours, 37 minutes, 48 seconds [0637 GMT]. The docking passed astonishingly smoothly, without a hitch. [passage omitted]

Military

Historian on Access to Military Archives

LD1202225890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1000 GMT on 11 February carries a 30-minute program entitled "Little-Known Pages of War" presented by Viktor Bosko.

Bosko introduces Col. Gen. Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov, head of the Institute of Military History of the USSR Ministry of Defense, who begins by noting that although history cannot be changed, more and more is learned about it as time passes. "In this sense, our institute, which deals with the military problems of history, possesses quite large possibilities, although I must say straight away that, as before, many archives are closed. In particular, in the party archives, and even in the military archives which it might seem should belong to us, there are still stocks to which they do not give us access. We need a law on archives, we need broad access for a broader range of people. But, nevertheless, we now know considerably more about the last war." Volkogonov says that memoirs of participants in the war are also important, but that Simonov's proposal for memoirs from front-line veterans to be collected and preserved did not gain support. Although much has been written on the Great Patriotic War, this has concentrated on the victories and left much unsaid.

Bosko says: "Of course we all know well the main milestones of the Great Patriotic War...

"[Volkogonov, interrupting] The victorious ones, primarily.

"[Bosko] (?As you were saying), there were facts of the war which it was previously not the custom to recall. So, what is the standpoint today of military historians, and your personal [word indistinct]?

"[Volkogonov] Maybe I could start with the documents. Here is an authentic document signed by Stalin, on 29 September 1941. In general, may I say of the prehistory of this document that Stalin received a report from the Leningrad Front signed by Zhdanov saying that the Germans were driving old men and women in front of their attacking ranks when they went into the offensive. What were they to do? In their confusion, men had retreated, and we had abandoned several trenches.

"Stalin straight away dictated—by the way, he often dictated many orders and directives—To Zhukov, Zhdanov, Kuznetsov and Merkulov: It is said that the German scoundrels advancing on Leningrad are sending old men, old women, women and children ahead of their troops to ask the bolsheviks to surrender Leningrad and establish a peace. They say that among the Leningrad bolsheviks there have been people who do not consider it possible to use arms against delegates of this type. I consider that if there are such people among the bolsheviks, Stalin dictated, then they must be annihilated first of all, for they are more dangerous than the German fascists. My advice, Stalin dictates, is not to get sentimental, but to pulverize the enemy and his accomplices, be they willing or not.

"I straight away saw in my mind's eye the children, the little kids, and they had to be pulverized." Volkogonov says this was a terrible order, and that the army commanders found ways around the problem which did not involve killing their compatriots. He reflects on how cruelty is a characteristic of war, but unnecessary cruelty is outrageous.

Bosko asks: "What about the punitive battalions, the theme of the punitive battalions. What a shameful silence we keep about this, do we not?"

Volkogonov replies: "In general, of course, front-line veterans and our literature have known that punitive battalions existed, but indeed it has somehow not been the thing to expand on. The preventive squads [zagradotryad; NKVD [Soviet secret police organization] troops who would follow punitive battalion troops and shoot them if they turned back], the punitive battalions—somehow it was thought that this belittles, insults the dignity of the Army. I remind you again, war is cruel, and indeed, in some critical moments, the commander, the body giving directions, have to sometimes adopt cruel measures to save the situation. But when this becomes the norm, it turns into its opposite. Here is another document, from 1943, when the war had already made the turn toward victory, when, you understand, it seemed that there was no longer any direct threat, it was clear that we would win, and only the date when the rout would be complete was not clear. And here Stalin signs a directive to the commanders of internal okrugs, to form on the territory of these okrugs—in particular, the Moscow military okrug, the Volga and Stalingrad ones—tens of punitive battalions from the special camps of the NKVD."

Volkogonov details various camps from which the men were to be drawn, and explains that for many this was their only chance to clear their name, as they had escaped from occupited territory but could not claim to have participated in partisan operations. Most of those in the battalions lost their lives. "Many of them, I know, distinguished themselves, and were able, as it were, to lift themselves out of nonexistence and restore their good name, but on the whole, the very attitude to a Soviet person who had suffered misfortune—because it was misfortune, personal misfortune, in the majority of cases, not through their own fault, but because of unskillful leadership miscalculations of the commanders, the mistakes that Stalin himself made on the eve of the war, and people found themselves encircled. That is, in essence, he laid his own blame at the door of those who found themselves, true to their military duty, having got out of encirclement, and ended up in the camps, and then they had to once again redeem what was really their nonexistent crime against him. That is cruel. There was a time that we gave these things no thought. I consider that such orders, directives, and instructions should also be known, and people should know about it, not just about how the war was cruel, but also how the person who was the supreme commander-in-chief was cruel, the person whom many people to this day virtually worship, and consider that in the sphere of the war, he has indeed kept his reputation, his historic reputation.

"[Bosko] We often talk about repressions against the command staff in the 1930's, in 1937 and so on. but we say almost nothing about the repressions in the Great Patriotic War, against the command staff.

"[Volkogonov] You know, I would just like to say that several hundred commanders, including tens of generals—because the rank of general emerged in 1940, May 1940—were repressed. Yes, among them were people, of course, who were traitors to (?their duty)—Vlasov, Malyshkin, for example, one could offer up a dozen names, I don't think there would be more. Such people were individual cases. But some who found themselves surrounded, for example, General Ponedelin, and many others, they were immediately counted among the enemies, as if they had surrendered specially. Many who ended up in an extremely unfavorable situation came under suspicion, and dozens of these generals, thousands of commanders, ended up in camps, many were shot. These are sad pages, of course, I stress that the extremely grave start to the war created an atmosphere where Stalin tried to find people to blame, to retaliate. In essence, he trusted nobody, and he did not trust many commanders. These are the pages about which, so far, little has been said, little has been written, and virtually no documents have been published. They exist, and are very extensive." Books to be published by the institute will tell not only of the victories, but also the less glorious side of the war, says Volkogonov.

[Bosko] asks: "Dmitriy Antonovich, you were talking about limitless sorrow, but for some reason I started thinking about this: Have you seen the film Belorussia Station?

"[Yolkogonov] Yes, I have seen it, of course.

"[Bosko] Do you remember the song in it: We all need one victory, one for all of us, and we don't care about the cost? I just cannot understand this at all.

"[Volkogonov] You know, this was even a kind of methodology. I shall just cite you one example, when a catastrophic situation formed in August-September near Stalingrad. There are documents—and they bring to mind many documents from Stalin—he dictates: Hold Stalingrad, regardless of what the casualties may be. And this expression is repeated frequently in many subsequent documents: Regardless of what the casualties may be.

"You understand, the art of war is really an art when it means achieving victory, reaching the objective, with the least losses, the least expenditure of human material and equipment. Stalin, of course, had a different approach, to achieve a specific aim regardless of what the casualties might be.

"I shall quote, perhaps, just a few examples. The cost of our victory was immense. Stalin wanted to speak about how many our country lost in the war for the first time in February 1946, but when Voznesenskiy said it was approximately, we could not count up right now, about 15 million, Stalin was silent, he did not say anything, then in passing he used the figure of 7.5 million. A second, more or less official figure, was given by Khrushchev in a letter to Erlander, in which he said it was about 20 million. I consider that in this statement it is only the word 'about' that is accurate.

"Together with the Academy of Sciences, the General Staff, and other academic centers, we are now trying to elucidate the true price our truly great suffered for—tragic victory, in a certain sense. For example, I have concluded, on the basis of extrapolation from much data that I have at my disposal, that the price of our victory was considerably greater. Our direct losses alone among the civilian population and servicemen in the last war were 26-28 million people. At the front, I reckon, we lost of the order of about 10 million people. At the front, I reckon, we lost of the order of about 10 million and we lost more civilians than we lost at the front. That is, considerably more, and moreover the indirect losses were even greater - those who never came to be born through starvation, and so on. But the direct losses that the war brought us were 26-28 million.

"Now, look I will give an example of how this was covered previously in our country. One of the greatest catastrophes of the Great Patriotic War was May 1942. The Sovinformburo, following our unsuccessful offensive and counter-attack by the Germans, reported that as a result of action in such and such a sector we had lost about 5,000 dead and 70,000 missing. The word captured was not used, in the summaries there just was no such category. But in fact we lost 240,000 dead and taken prisoner. And they said 5,000. You understand, this keeping silent, this concealment, in history subsequently as well, is sad.

"History has another feature; I spoke of its irreversibility at the beginning, and another feature is that it does not permit truth to be kept in life imprisonment. The truth sooner or later gains its freedom, and it cannot be held back, not in any archives, not in any secret hiding places or safes. Sooner or later, 10 or 20 years later, half a century later, the truth will come to light. And I do not think that this at all belittles our people, which was able to overcome everything at the price of immense losses, not through its own fault, it managed to endure it and in the final analysis to preserve and rescue freedom and independence. But it was a cost that was immeasurably greater than it need have been. The miscalculations, the mistakes, the crimes, especially on the eve of the war and at the beginning of it, led to the cost of our victory, the incredibly, bitterly large number of casualties that we laid on the altar of this great victory."

Bosko asks about defeats during the war. Volkogonov says that indeed, little is mentioned in textbooks about any defeats among the 50 or so major operations that took place. "For example, I consider that our most terrible defeat in the last war, for the number of casualties, it is sad, it is very difficult for me to talk about it, was in August-September near Kiev. The Kiev defensive operation, when, as a result of an unfortunate combination of circumstances, of unskillful leadership, miscalculations by the command and personally by Stalin, who literally a few days before the catastrophe and in August-September was still talking (?Kirponos) and demanding: Not a step back, do not surrender Kiev. The cost of this was that the German group surrounded about five of our armies, in full or not with all their men, and 452,000 of our troops were surrounded. I think that was the biggest catastrophe. They fought bravely, to the last man, to the last round, some of them managed to escape the encirclement, but it was a terrible catastrophe which has not yet been described." Volkogonov then reflects on the false picture that is presented by balancing out the statistics.

Bosko asks: "Dmitriy Antonovich, we are often asked, especially by war veterans, about when an honest history of the terrible war that our people experienced will finally be written. There are very many letters, including several from your Orenburg Oblast, where, as I know, you are standing for Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's deputy, and from many other places. What do you think, will this be covered, please do tell us."

"[Volkogonov] Yes, I think that front-liners are particularly justified in making demands of historians about when an honest history of the Great Patriotic War will be written. You know, a multitude of books has been written, and not all the books, of course, are lies or inaccurate. No, there are quite a few good books, for example, "In the Trenches of Stalingrad" by Viktor Nekrasov, and Simonov wrote one of the best accounts of the last war. One could name many good books. But on the whole, especially the official publications, they go wrong in that there are always points covering the short term, half-truths, things left unsaid. I think that in this regard, the six-volume work published many years ago, soon after the 20th congress, the six-volume work on the Great Patriotic War, that was the most honest.

"But the 12-volume history of the Second World War, in this everything was done to please one person, Brezhnev, who in general was portrayed virtually as the savior of the nation, virtually the most important figure, the leader, with all its significance, let us say, and the heroism of those who participated was portrayed as virtually of decisive importance in the last war. And this short-term approach, the things left unsaid, the half-truths, of course they seriously undermined the trust of the front-liners and our readers in military history. What is being done to put this situation right? Now we know that history is experiencing as it were a renaissance, a rebirth, in the sense of a possibility of saying the whole truth, everything as it was.

"And now the Institute of Military History is preparing a large book, or rather not a book but a large collection of 10 volumes called "The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People." Its title says who the main hero is—the people, the Soviet people. We have written the first volume, we are now discussing it, we think it will be ready by the end of the year, then every year two volumes will come out, that is, we will have the ten-volume work finished in the course of five years, or maximum six, I think." Vokogonov says the principle is to include only the facts, and that many institutions and veterans are helping write this work. Bosko says it is gratifying to hear that such a work is being written.

Bosko asks: "What are you working on at the moment, if that is not a secret?"

Volkogonov replies: "My book has come out, a political portrait of Stalin, and I think that by the spring I shall finish also a big political portrait of Trotsky. Following that, well, now I will give away a secret, because I have been working on it for a long time, I want to write a book, an honest book, about Lenin. You understand, the three is for me, perhaps, the main thing in my life. I am finishing off the book on Trotsky, it too is all based on documents, there were four volumes on Stalin, it looks like there will be three on Trotsky, and as for Lenin I do not know, because the material is vast, I don't know if I'll manage, but whatever the case, the aspiration, the wish, the intention is there." Volkogonov says that he has gathered material for the book on Trotsky from wide-ranging sources. He is also working on some collections of wartime documents.

Komsomol Urged to Influence Interethnic Disputes

PM1202150190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Feb 90 Single Edition p 2

[Major A. Zhigarev report under the "Komsomol Conferences" rubric: "Not in the Mood for Empty Talk"]

[Excerpts] A Transcaucasus Military District Komsomol [Communist Youth League] conference has been held in Tbilisi. [passage omitted]

The conversation focused on one question—what must be done to ensure that the Komsomol effectively influences such a complex sphere of human relations as interethnic relations, which are moreover conditioned by the situation in the region. A program for practical actions was elaborated as a result. The conference participants adopted an address to Komsomol members and young people in the Transcaucasus, calling on them to give the utmost assistance in bringing the situation in the region back to normal and putting an end to the orgy of sinister emotions.

The conference was addressed by Colonel General V. Patrikeyev, commander of the district, and Major General A. Skoryy, member of the Military Council and chief of the district Political Directorate. B. Khatidze, secretary of the Georgian Komsomol Central Committee, answered numerous questions from conference delegates.